A MELTING POT OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

ADA KNIGHT TERRELL

145-36

261.8
T325

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/meltingpotofchri0000unse

Ut Credat Mundus

A MELTING POT OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY
ADA KNIGHT TERRELL, A.M.
TEACHER OF MODERN LANGUAGES
BELHAVEN COLLEGE
JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

"It is the duty of the Christian sects of today, to make, out of the mistakes and failures of the past, a conspicuous future success."

THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS IOWA
1923

Copyrighted 1923
By Ada Knight Terrell

THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS
IOWA

To
the cause of Religious Education in the Homes and in the Schools of Today, this book is dedicated

PREFACE

According to the latest census, there now exist not less than two hundred Christian denominations to be cast into the Melting Pot of reorganizations suited to our democratic age. The inquiring mind desires to know how and why things have come to be as they are. Hence, the writer of the following pages has been prompted to trace, historically, the growth of Christian unity, by the conviction that such progress is recorded in the history of Christian activities.

The linking of causes and effects is the immortal part of history. All generations need to study history in order to understand the trend of events of their own age. Knowledge of church organizations of the past is essential to an understanding of the changes taking place today; because those least acquainted with the growth of sectarianism are, usually, the most dogmatic, bigoted, exclusive and conservative.

No attempt is made in this historic sketch to present the evolution of Christianity. Selection has been made only of certain incidents which illustrate the causes of *disunity* and those that reveal the *unifying* spiritual forces in constant operation. The word-pictures of occurrences have been merely outlined. It is left to those desiring fuller information, to supply, by further study, the failing lights and shades.

As an organization, the Christian Church has evolved

around two great ideas, Imperialism, and Democracy. As a system of faith and practice, also, it has produced two great thought-epochs which have modified and multiplied creeds. Hence, the theme of this book naturally divides itself into two parts, The First Period and The Second Period of Creedal Christianity.

It has been said, "Not by compromise but by comprehension should the unification of the churches be undertaken." This humble offering has been made to the cause of Christian unity in the hope of inspiring others to pursue the subject further, and by the light of the Holy Spirit, supply such deficiencies as may be detected herein.

ADA KNIGHT TERRELL

June 1st, 1923

CONTENTS

PART FIRST

The First Constructive Period of Creedal Christianity — The Imperial Church of Rome and the Nicene Creed

CHAPTER I
Conceptions and Misconceptions 15

CHAPTER II
The Roman Church and the Nicene Creed 25

CHAPTER III
Heresies and Schisms 34

CHAPTER IV
Monastic Institutions 43

CHAPTER V
Mohammedanism 56

CHAPTER VI
The Crusades 67

CHAPTER VII
The Papal Empire, or Romanism 78

CHAPTER VIII
The Roman Church and the People 95

PART SECOND

The Second Period of Creedal Christianity — The Democratic Christian Church and the Clarified and Enriched Creed

CHAPTER I
Martin Luther, the Leader of the Protestant Reformation ---------- 111

CHAPTER II
Reform within the Imperial Church---------- 122

CHAPTER III
The Metaphysical Stage of Theology---------- 133

CHAPTER IV
Medieval Theology and Modern Science---------- 144

CHAPTER V
Unifying Forces Discovered---------- 155

CHAPTER VI
Christian Unity at Work---------- 164

CHAPTER VII
The Interchurch World Movement of North America ---------- 175

CHAPTER VIII
Ventures and Adventures---------- 185

CHAPTER IX
Concluding Comments---------- 196

PART FIRST

The First Constructive Period of Creedal Christianity—The Imperial Church of Rome and the Nicene Creed.

THE QUESTION UNIVERSAL

"'I seek my brethren. Do you know where they may be found?' These words Joseph spoke when he was sent out to find his brethren. 'Do you know where they may be found?' he asked of every passer-by. In that question he expressed the longing of the whole world. We are seeking our brethren. Do you know where they may be found? It seems pathetic that in this great world of about seventeen hundred millions of people any one should find himself alone; that any one should be asking where are his brethren; should be hunting them here and there; searching in the highways and byways, whilst thousands are rushing by and leaving him seeking some congenial soul to whom he may pour out his own heart. Loneliness is the tragedy of the world. The hearts of men and women are hungering after true fellowship. The greatest boon to the hungry heart is companionship; it is the heaven of life. Religion has set itself the task of building up a human brotherhood. It has failed to create this brotherhood because it has failed to keep this one issue in mind."

— Rabbi Joseph Silverman, New York City.

CHAPTER I

CONCEPTIONS AND MISCONCEPTIONS

Shakespeare has pictured all the world as a stage and men and women as merely actors — making, it is to be inferred, their entrance at birth and their exit at death. The pathos of many of the dramas, often amounting to high tragedy, arises from the many misconceptions of the players who mistake fancy for fact and error for truth.

In no department of human thought have so many misconceptions abounded as in religion — "the God-consciousness of the human soul." The cause of these misconceptions is readily discoverable. It lies in the universal consciousness of many irresistible influences outside of the personal self. Immersed in a great sea of invisible forces, every conscious being must form some conception or misconception of himself and his environment, and their sustaining agencies. Hence, the concept of creative energy, called God, common to all human beings, furnishes the fundamental basis for the classification of all religions, and permits but two great divisions — polytheism which worships many gods of varying degrees of wisdom, power, and righteousness; and monotheism which worships one living God, infinite, eternal, and omnipotent.

On account of their limited knowledge, primitive men formed many misconceptions of creative energy. The complex system of thought called polytheism sets to the

credit of a multitude of gods, both good and bad, many achievements. As a religion, polytheism found expression in the worship of idols at sacrificial altars in magnificent temples. Today polytheism, neither as a system of thought, nor idolatry as a system of religion, occupies the minds of enlightened peoples, who understand somewhat better than did the earlier races some of the invisible forces of nature — as heat, light, electricity, and the vital forces.

Monotheism requires such sustained and accurate thinking as to present great difficulties to the human mind. Therefore, agnosticism, the belief that "the existence of a personal Deity can be neither proved nor disproved," takes ready possession of the mind. Agnosticism readily passes into either atheism or pantheism. The atheist regards the universe "as sufficient unto itself, without either ultimate origin or destiny." The pantheist seeks to identify creative energy with the totality of things. He affirms, "Out from the eternal source of all things and all phenomena, all things proceed and into the same source must all ultimately return and be absorbed."

These familiar isms do not exhaust the possible concepts of God — when considered either as universal Mind or as universal Substance. It must be admitted by all that no attainable degree of mental power can insure the finite mind against the danger of misconceptions or misstatements concerning the Infinite and Eternal. Differences of conception, however, are not proofs of misconceptions; for many and diverse ideas are necessary to complete the Mosaic of Universal Truth.

Every vision of the universe depends upon two conditions — upon the viewpoint of the beholder and upon his

seeing powers. To change either of these two conditions is to change the whole perspective of the panorama of spiritual vision. This fact, then, explains the origin of the great variety of concepts concerning everything in the universe — some of which are true, some false, and all incomplete as to origin and destiny. Hence, different viewpoints and unequal seeing-powers are the causes of inevitable differences of opinion concerning Christianity among individuals and races at various stages of spiritual unfoldment.

To the law of differentiation, Christianity with its more than two hundred varieties of sects, is no exception. Among these denominations, the tenets of some are inclusive, the one of the other; some are merely supplementary to each other; while many are diametrically opposed to all others, and hence, are divisive. The diverse concepts have alienated friends, segregated communions, and created a hostile sectarianism. As a result of the many conflicting opinions and practices among persons claiming the name of Christian, the questions naturally arise: What is Christianity? What differentiates it from philosophy and science? And wherein does Christianity differ from the pagan faiths?

In the study of Christianity, it may be seen that the divisive conceptions may be summed up as those concerning the Personality of the Christ, His teachings, and His Church as it has developed through two thousand years.

Human misconceptions concerning the Divine Personality of the Christ have characterized every phase of His earthly existence; His miraculous birth, His tragic infancy and His secluded life; His authoritative teachings, His

marvelous powers and His cruel crucifixion; His incomprehensible resurrection, and His redemptive mission among men — all these mysteries have alike amazed and confounded vast multitudes of unspiritualized men. For two thousand years, the sublime victories of His earthly life have been reported by many as dismal and discouraging human failures.

The Christ Himself disappointed the Messianic hope of His own age by His humble birth, His life of humility, His doctrine of universal love, and by His ignominious death on the Cross.

Since the Jews were expecting that the Prince of Peace would appear as a mighty conqueror who would deliver them from the dominion of the Romans, "He came to His own and His own received Him not." Because His own received Him not, a so-called new religion, or New Dispensation, was naturally evolved out of the old, bearing the sacred name of the Master of Gallilee who proclaimed to all "the eternal evangel of the soul." From that day to this, countless dramas of misconception concerning the Holy One, yes tragedies of cruel persecution of Christians by Christians, have been enacted.

The origin of the philosophy of life taught by Jesus of Nazareth and the correct interpretation and application of these principles have been, and still are, subjects of bitter controversy. While Christianity as a religious system had an undisputed historic beginning more than twenty centuries ago, in an age that violently opposed it, it is now known to students of religion that the ethical teachings of Jesus of Nazareth ante-date His incarnation in the Land of Judea. To some minds it seems to be no

disparagement of the Christianity of today to admit that its rituals, doctrines, and ideals date back beyond the days of Abraham, Moses, and David around whose head clustered the hopes of the Messiah; for it is well known that traditions precede authentic history, and that the beginnings of all religions are deeply buried in the mystery of the impenetrable past.

Concerning the origin and validity of His doctrines, Jesus Himself said: "My doctrine is not Mine, but His That sent me. If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether I speak of Myself, or whether it be of God." It is now generally conceded that Paul was right, "The Living God has never left Himself without witnesses." Through all the centuries of the past, in every civilization, "the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance" have abounded as evidences of the presence of the Holy Spirit among men. Yet the fact remains that, just as recent controversies concerning the antiquity of the race itself have divided Christians into two hostile camps, so also, evidences of the antiquity and universality of the Religion of the Spirit have been repudiated by churchmen as punishable heresies.

Furthermore, the exact meaning of the word "Church," and questions concerning its origin, nature, powers, government, continuance, and its relation to the Holy Scriptures and to the State — all these questions have been fruitful matters of controversy for centuries.

It is the claim of some historians that the origin of the Church can be traced to the personal activities of "The Fellowship of the New Life" which definitely marked the

advent of the Christian Era; others contend that numerous simultaneous beginnings of the Church, now blotted from the pages of history, are traceable in the institutions of today; and a third class, claiming to be the sole holders of Christ's commission, are today condemning each other as ecclesiastical frauds, and excluding each other and all others from Christian fellowship.

However, history concerns itself less with the origin of the Church and its creeds than with its organizations, its ecclesiasticism, its sects and schisms, and with its methods of evangelization and its unification. As we turn to the past we are appalled with the vastness, both chronologically and geographically, of the stage upon which has been enacted "The Drama of Conceptions and Misconceptions concerning the Christ."

In searching the pages of history to find a definition of Chirstianity as a basis for the reorganization of its various sects, it is important to keep in mind that Jesus of Nazareth set forth His doctrine in terms of a personal relationship among men having a common spiritual Father. His system is summed up by Himself in the command, "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength: this is the first great commandment. The second is like unto it: thou shalt love thy neighbor as thy self. There is no other commandment greater than these."

Likewise the goal of personal attainment as set forth by the Master (who was tempted in all points like as ourselves, yet without sin) is expressed in the command, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

Concerning His mission on earth Jesus said: "I am

come that they may have life and have it more abundantly.'' It must be remembered that the more abundant life imparted to millions of Christians is recognizable by the spiritual vitality of the redeemed themselves and in no other way. Hence it may be seen that not in the dogmas, the rituals and organizations of the various communions is recorded the true history of Christianity, but in the hearts and lives of multitudes of redeemed men — redeemed from human animality by the power of divine forces operating in human personalities. On the indestructible soul is recorded the transforming power of the Christ, that makes His commands the sum and substance of a universal religion.

It has been said that the creeds of the more than two hundred denominations now express every possible statement of differences of opinion upon every topic connected with Christianity; and that every form of organization has now been tested. At least, everything has been called in question concerning the outward forms of the Church — from the attitude of the worshiper in prayer to the varied forms of administering the sacred rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and from the ordination of the priesthood only by an invisible outpouring of the Holy Spirit (an enduement from on high) to a complete system of ecclesiastical ceremonies. It is claimed, also, that the evolution of Christian dogmas culminated in ''the denial of the reality of sin, sickness, and death.'' If such be the case, it may be inferred that the process of differentiation in Christianity is completed, and that a unifying process has begun. Many believe that in the movements of the present century are discernible the embryo of a new creedal

Christianity and the beginning of the evolution of ecclesiasticism along new lines. Whatever truth or error may be in these judgments, one thing is evident, as the result of a common view-point, a gradual clarification of the creeds is now taking place; and by the growing-together of local communions and the federation of national organizations, a method of unification has begun.

A recorded prayer of the Master is as follows: "Holy Father, keep through Thine Own name, those whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are one. . . . As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, may they also be in Us. . . . I have declared unto them Thy name and will declare it; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me, may be in them and I in them." Such a prayer may be accepted at the very outset of the discussion as evidence that a religion founded upon a consciousness of the unity of God and man will finally prevail over all misconceptions of the past; and that it is possible to establish a Church upon the basis of Good-will among men who recognize themselves as children of the one and only spiritual Father of the race. How to accomplish this heroic task is the problem of the hour among all who consider themselves viceregents of Christ on earth.

The purpose of the historical survey reported in the following chapters is the discovery of a rational basis for the reorganization of the three branches of the Christian Church — the Roman, the Greek, and the Protestant.

History has been called, "philosophy teaching by experience." The incentive on the part of the writer of these pages to furnish the laity with the historic view-point in the quest for a rational basis for the reorganiza-

tion of Christian fellowship, arises from the conviction that man is a rational being who must learn by experience. Individuals who are willing to test the doctrines of the Christ by "living the life," may learn from their own personal experiences; but races can learn only from the totality of racial experiences, recorded on the pages of history.

To what extent the historic view-point assumed by the writer may serve to widen the spiritual horizon of the readers of the following chapters, no one can foresee; nor what measure of service the message therein contained may contribute to the further growth of Christian unity, no one can predict.

A statement gleaned from *The Northwestern Christian Advocate* furnishes a heartening illustration of the manner in which the mysterious power of the Holy Spirit is conveyed by the instrumentality of books. It is said: "A little more than two hundred years ago, an old Puritan wrote a book, and died, not knowing what use was made of his book. Of who he was, we are still in doubt. He called his book, *The Bruised Reed.* Richard Baxter was converted by reading his book, and then wrote *A Call to the Unconverted.*

"Philip Doddridge was converted by reading *The Call to the Unconverted.* Doddridge then wrote *The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul,* and William Wilberforce was converted by reading Doddridge's book and wrote *A Practical View of Christianity.*

"Thomas Chalmers was converted by reading the book by Wilberforce, and he also wrote a book, which, in its turn, caused Leigh Richmond to write *The Dairyman's*

Daughter, a modern book, said to have been the means of converting many.''

Thus it is that for the furtherance of God's plans for human progress, the ever present influence of the Holy Spirit is circulating in thousands of channels impossible to trace. Hence it is with the hope of inspiring others, that a few incomplete word-pictures of ''The Drama of Conceptions and Misconceptions of the Christ'' are presented to all beholders of the sketches drawn, who possess ''the seeing eye'' and the receptive mind.

CHAPTER II

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND THE NICENE CREED

Looking backward through the dark and troubled period of the persecutions of Christians by non-Christians, we come upon the Apostolic Age. There we find "The Fellowship of the New Life" represented by small groups of Christians scattered here and there, and living a life so transformed — emotionally, morally and spiritually — as to give a new valuation to all earthly things. The desire to do the will of the heavenly Father was their highest aspiration. To the Holy Spirit believed to be present among them they looked for instruction and guidance. The only cohesive principle necessary to bind them together was the command of the Master to love God supremely and their neighbors as themselves. Many of them lived and labored together in harmonious groups, voluntarily holding their property in common. Imbued with a common faith derived from a common view-point, persecutions of Christian by Christian was unheard of for some years of the first century.

As their numbers increased, persecutions of Christians by non-Christians became more numerous; and martyrdom for opinion's sake became more frequent and widespread. Faith in the risen Christ and the surprising doctrine of the resurrection of the dead amazed the Roman idolaters and aroused their indignation. The very sim-

plicity of Christianity was found blameworthy by the competing cults. It was a common accusation of their enemies that the Christians had no temples, no altars, no images of gods. It had long been the custom of the Romans to tolerate the religions of the idolatrous nations; but they refused to grant toleration to the Christians. Roman opposition to Christianity had a political basis. Because the Christians refused to offer sacrifices to the pagan gods and to worship the Roman emperors, they were regarded as enemies of the political state. Thus we find that to the inherent spiritual unity that existed among the early Christians, at a later date was added the necessity for a close outward coöperation as a means of self-defense against a common enemy — the enmity of the pagan faiths.

With the lapse of time and the further spread of the doctrines of the Christ, conditions and ideas changed, and inharmonies arose among different groups. Christians separated geographically, came to differ as widely in their conceptions of the Master and His message and mission on earth as they did in language, custom, and racial peculiarities. Thus sect after sect arose, all tinged with local and racial beliefs. The various peoples of the vast Roman Empire seized upon certain golden grains of truth in the gospel of Christ, gave them an entirely new setting in their own pagan philosophy, and finally stamped them as "the only legal tender" circulating among many spurious and debased coins of Christianity. Such then is, briefly stated, the historic account of the beginning of the various conflicting metaphysical speculations and controversies concerning the Personality of the Christ.

It is not to be inferred from the foregoing that the

Personality of the founder of the Christian system of religion is unimportant; for their faith in the Divine Man, "born from above," was the basis of their faith in His authoritative teachings — the little leaven of spiritual truth that has leavened the whole lump.

With the foregoing facts in mind, we may rivet our attention upon the Fourth Century, A.D. — a time when a war of dogmas concerning the Personality of the Christ was raging furiously in many of the Roman provinces. In Alexandria, Egypt, the famous Arian controversy arose — a question concerning "the relationship of the God-head before the incarnation of the Christ and before the beginning of time." To such an extent had Christianity become the one absorbing theme of the age, that it is said, "Not only were learned divines lined up for the discussion at storm centers, but artisans and peasants became zealous partizans eager for the fray — the war of words." At that period, as always, unity and harmony were necessary for the promulgation of a gospel of good-will among men; hence the necessity arose for formulating out of the diverse opinions of Christians, an authoritative creed concerning "the author and finisher of the faith." "If Christ be not risen," said Paul in his day, "then is our preaching vain, and your faith also vain." In those remote centuries, as now, facts were to be made the foundation of faith, and unanimity of opinion was necessary for concerted action.

Upon this battlefield of dogma appeared Emperor Constantine, fresh from "a miraculous conversion," it is said, "by the sudden appearance of a flaming cross in the sky at noon-day,"— the emblem by which he was to conquer. Thus convinced of his mission to befriend the Christians,

he became full of high hopes of uniting the Christians of the Empire under "the sign of the Cross." The discovery of unlooked for dissensions in the Church disappointed him. In a letter to the Alexandrian Church, he expressed deep grief to find his newly adopted faith violently rent asunder; and he begged the disputants to abandon their disputes and to return to the harmony befitting their common faith. But in vain; the controversy had gone too far beyond the bounds of reason for the disputants to be able, voluntarily and unaided, to establish unanimity and harmony. The abstruse question of the relationship of the Trinity in the God-head served to arouse the temper of men as no practical question could have done. Since the dispute could be settled neither by any process of logic, nor by an appeal to the facts in the case, it must be settled by discovering the preponderance of personal opinion expressed in some definite and official manner.

In this dilemma, in the year 325 A.D., Emperor Constantine issued a call for a great Council of all branches of the Church to settle the controversy. He addressed letters to all of the bishops designating Nicea, the capital of Bythinia, as the place of meeting. He embarked upon the project with the zeal of an inspired genius. He offered to pay all the expenses of the delegates, to act as host, and to preside at the meeting.

In a frenzy of excitement and enthusiasm, the one hundred and eighteen bishops who were to compose the Council were duly appointed, and soon assembled in a hall of the royal palace. Each bishop was entitled to two presbyters and two slaves in the retinue. Thus the Council was marked by variety of types of character. In the

throng were dwellers in Egyptian deserts whose names were taken from the gods of Pharaoh, ascetics from the remote East, and hermits clad in rough goat-hair who had come from lonely mountains. There were present the learned and the illiterate, courtiers and peasants, aged bishops and beardless boys acting as deacons. A large number of the delegates were old men who had lived through the last and worst of the ten persecutions — "an army of martyrs who came out like a regiment from battle decimated by torture and bearing the marks of cruel persecution, the loss of an eye or a limb."

However, it was a small group of distinguished theologians and polished logicians who dominated the discussion and set their stamp upon the Christian thought of the age, and determined, in a large measure, the orthodox faith of Christendom today concerning the Personality of the Christ.

As we view the scene through the eyes of history, we find that on the one side was the unyielding Arius whose high-pitched voice chanted forth vague abstractions. He was supported by Eusebius of Nicomedia, by the uncompromising Teuton, Theophilus, and by a dozen other defenders of the doctrine, "The Son is subordinate to the Father." On the other side was arrayed Eusebius Caesarea, "the Father of Church History," Hosius of Cordovia, the spiritual director of the Western Empire, and a large company of supporters, some of them high officials in the Roman Empire.

The language employed was the Greek. The hairsplitting questions discussed were "the houmoosian" versus "the homoiousion"— words, it is said, that defy correct translation into the English tongue.

In spite of the impatience of the crowd and the earnest efforts of the Emperor to hasten the settlement of the question, the discussion dragged and the deliberations lasted sixty-seven days — from June 19th to August 26th. The disputants had come to the Council with the full determination not to be converted to the opposite opinion, but to convert their opponents.

In the course of the proceedings, Arius presented to the assembly his version of the creed. The document was immediately seized by an opponent and torn to shreds on the spot. Eusebius then presented to the delegates a creed (selected from thirty others slightly differing), one similar to the familiar Apostle's Creed of today. It was immediately rejected by the Council because it did not serve to settle the point in dispute. Finally Hosius presented a statement of the faith so modified as to entirely exclude every trace of Arianism. It was received with joyful applause, adopted, and finally signed by all the bishops but two. It was worded as follows: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth and all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things are made; Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnated by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; Who suffered and was buried, and on the third day rose again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right

hand of God, the Father. And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, Whose kingdom shall have no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father (and from the Son), Who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, and Who spake by the Prophets. And we believe in one (Holy) Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sin, and we look for the resurrection of the dead and for life of the world to come."

("We" was used in the earlier copies where "I" is now used.)

The Creed adopted was called Athanasian in honor of Athanasius, an Egyptian arch-deacon, although he neither drafted the document, nor presented it to the Council, nor cast a vote either for it or against it. Yet he is well entitled to the honor of the name, since his spirit dominated the Council, and throughout a long life of varied fortunes, he was a champion of Trinitarianism as it is understood today by its advocates. No one can say that the victory for the Athanasian faction over the Arians was not fairly won by a vote taken after due discussion of the subject. The principle of the rule of the majority had been employed in the Roman Republic, and hence commanded the respect of the entire assembly. It is safe to assert that no reasonable person today will question the right of Christendom, at any time, to formulate, and revise, and promulgate its own creed.

It is to the credit of Emperor Constantine and his Council that at the time, the Arians were dealt with gently. The deprivation of clerical honors, the curtailing of author-

ity, and temporary banishment were the extremes of chastisement recommended. The truly Christian spirit shown in the admonitions of the Emperor are well worthy of consideration. Seated upon the golden throne erected in the Palace hall where the assembly had met, Emperor Constantine arose and expressed in Latin the following sentiment: "Let the Christians avoid their party strife; let them envy no one distinguished for wisdom, but regard the merit of every individual as common property. God only can judge who is superior. Perfection is rare, allowances must be made for the weaker brethren; slight matters, forgiven; human infirmities, allowed for; and concord prized above all else; since factions only cause the enemies to the faith to blaspheme. In all ways unbelievers must be saved. Let Christians be like physicians, and accommodate the medicine to the disease, the teachings, to the minds of all."

Notwithstanding the blemishes of his personal character, Constantine claimed to have acted "under Divine guidance" in the matter of calling the Council. No one today can gainsay his assertion, for no one knows under what compulsion he may have acted in so doing.

At the conclusion of the convention, Constantine produced from the folds of his imperial mantle countless papyrus rolls containing charges of personal and doctrinal enmities, and caused them to be burned with the seal unbroken.

Having completed the task of formulating an authoritative and official creed for the Christian Church of the Roman Empire, the Council of Nicea dissolved. The delegates were happy in the delusion that they had provided

"a full and final explanation of the Father and the Son; and of Man and the Holy Ghost." As a result of this "explanatory finality," they expected permanent peace to descend upon the entire Christian world. But not so. The Arians, "convinced against their will, were of the same opinion still."

As soon as Constantine had made himself protector of Christianity by making it the official religion of the Empire, he issued an edict by which all penal restraints were removed, and full liberty of conscience was allowed to all to adopt whatever form of religion they should prefer. It is said that the Emperor judged that to overcome the competing cults, nothing was required but to offer protection to Christianity. He believed that through allegiance to the Divine Man, "the Very God of Very God," the various races of the vast Empire would be transformed into one harmonious people. Although the unification of the people of Europe by means of language and religion has not yet been accomplished, the progress that has been made in the blending of languages, religions, and races, shows that the heroic faith of Constantine was not in vain.

In the manner briefly narrated the stupendous change from the old Jewish Dispensation to the new Christian Era was brought about in the course of time. Through "the Sign of the Cross," "the Religion of the Spirit," as taught by Jesus of Nazareth, was freed from bondage to the customs of the Jewish race, and embodied in the organized Church of Rome to become a thoroughly Romanized institution; because "when the Romans became Christianized, Christianity became Romanized."

CHAPTER III

HERESIES AND SCHISMS

It is not uncommon for persons of our age to speak with haughty contempt of the religious discussions which occupied the thought of former ages; but a careful comparison of the debatable questions of the past with those of the present, reveals the fact that they are substantially one and the same. Although most persons of our day would need to consult an encyclopaedia to learn the exact meaning of the various heresies as they were named and known in Church history, it has been truthfully said, "History repeats itself." For after the lapse of centuries, we are again discussing the themes of the ante-Nicene period of the Church. Yet history never repeats itself exactly. From age to age, discussion rises to higher planes of comprehension; for men build upon newly discovered facts, and take wider views of things. This increase of knowledge and wider view provide for constant progress. Hence, it has been said with equal truthfulness, "The path of progress is a rising spiral." Many of the debatable questions of physical science have been settled by the logic of events and by an appeal to the senses and to reason. For example, the circumnavigation of the globe forever settled the question of the rotundity of the earth. But not so with metaphysical questions of a certain class. Questions concerning the nature of the Deity and the

Christ; the whence and whither of the soul; the fact of Heaven and Hell; and other similar questions are still under discussion, not only by theologians, but by the thinking laity.

In order to give the reader a more intelligent comprehension of the pronouncements of the Church upon doctrines called "heresies" which have caused a breach of unity in the faith, and the contentions for ecclesiastical jurisdiction that have created "schisms" in the Roman Church, a brief epitome of some of them is here introduced.

As was shown in the foregoing chapter, by the adoption of the Nicene creed Arianism was checked but not suppressed. The heresy continued to find many patrons and supporters among those of rank and power — including several emperors who succeeded Constantine. But no sooner were the heretics clothed with sufficient power than they, also, in violation of the law of love, began to persecute the orthodox portion of the Roman Church with the same vehemence that they had been persecuted. Thus began the persecution of Christian by Christian with a violence little inferior to that meted out to them by the pagans.

To the discussion of the rank of the Son in the God-head, carried on by the Arians, was added in the same century, "the denial of the procession of the Holy Ghost." This denial was known as the Macedonian heresy. In order to overcome the general confusion of thought that arose on the subject, Theodocius the Great called a council to convene at Constantinople in the year 381 A.D. One hundred and fifty orthodox bishops and thirty of the Macedonian party constituted the council. The orthodox party, being

in the majority, declared in explicit terms, "The Holy Ghost is Lord and Giver of Life, Who with the Father and with the Son is equally adored and glorified." This is the famous "filioque clause."

About the middle of the fourth century arose what is known as "the schism of Donatus," which resulted from a contest concerning the validity of the election of the Bishop of Carthage. The party of Donatus prevailed; and when in power, they re-asserted the Arian and Macedonian heresies — contending that "God, the Son, is less than God, the Father, and greater than the Holy Ghost." They denounced the clergy of the orthodox Church, and announced with the assurance of orthodoxy itself that "with them alone existed true virtue and religion." Finally, Saint Augustine, the learned Bishop of Hippo, refuted the arguments of the heretics in such a satisfactory manner that for a time the discussion subsided.

In the fourth century arose what is known as "the Pelagian heresy," which derives its name from Pelagius, a monk of Wales, who went to Rome to live and to study. He denied the existence of original sin in the soul of man; and rejected the idea of the necessity for Divine grace for the merit of good works, contending that Adam, by sinning, affected himself only, and that his descendants were born in the state in which they would have been had he never sinned. Several Councils were held to condemn the teaching.

In the fifth century, arose what is known as "the Nestorian Heresy," which takes its name from the Bishop of Constantinople, Nestorius. He taught that the two distinct persons in Jesus Christ, God and man, were joined

together in a moral union in such a manner that the Godhead dwelt in the humanity merely as in a temple. Hence it is said that he denied the Incarnation, or that God was made man. He also asserted that the Blessed Virgin Mary ought not to be called "the Mother of God," but the Mother of the man, Jesus, Whose humanity was only the temple of the Divinity. This heresy was suppressed at the Council of Ephesus in the year 432 A.D.

In the year 451 A.D. a council was held at Chalcedon for the purpose of condemning "the heresy of Eutychus," who maintained that "Jesus Christ had but one nature; that His human nature was totally absorbed by the Divine and became one with it; so that the Christ had no real body, and consequently, as a Divine nature, was incapable of suffering; that He had neither died nor suffered really, but in appearance only." This doctrine continued to spread in the East for nearly a century. It was condemned by the Council of Constantinople in the year 553 A.D.

In the eighth century, Emperor Leo, surnamed the Isaurian, having ascended the throne of Constantinople, conceived a great aversion to the images of Christ and the Virgin Mary and the Saints which were used in the Church, and ordered their removal under the severest penalties. This sect was called "the Iconoclasts" or image-breakers, who declared that "Christ in His glorified humanity, though not incorporeal, was yet exalted above all the limits and defects of a sensuous nature, and too exalted, therefore, to be figured by human art, after the analogy of other human bodies." In carrying into effect this extraordinary edict concerning images, recalcitrant

bishops were ejected from their posts, and much violence and bloodshed were occasioned. The disturbances continued to rage until the convocation of a council at Nicea in the year 787 A.D. This council was attended by three hundred bishops, representing the churches from all parts of the world. After due deliberation, they unanimously declared that the pictures and images of Jesus Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints are useful in the churches and elsewhere; that they recall forcibly to the minds of those who behold them the scenes they represent; that they may be venerated and honored, not indeed with the supreme honor that belongs to God alone, but with a relative and inferior honor, such as every Christian entertains for the Bible in which the divine law is written." (Also at the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century the subject of images was reconsidered, and it was declared not only that the images should be retained, but that due honor and veneration should be accorded them by kissing and prostration before them.)

The foundation for the Greek Schism was laid in the year 866 A.D. by a contest for the Patriarchial Chair at Constantinople. The Greek, Philotus, called together a synod of bishops, and pronounced sentence of deposition and excommunication against Nicolas, the Roman pontiff. The inveterate prejudice against the discipline of the Roman Church resulted, several centuries later, in the complete separation of the Church of the East from that of the West. It has been said, "In the contest between Pope and Patriarch, synod after synod was convened; each party, as it secured the necessary majority, roundly anathematized the other — now with the scorn of the fin-

ished scholar for the ruder Latin civilization, now with the disgust of the practical West for the hair-splitting subtleties of the East."

We may pause at this juncture to consider some of the underlying causes that have led to a complete severance of the two wings of the Church, the Eastern and the Western. The divisive agencies may be summed up as racial, political, and ecclesiastical. Undoubtedly the most deeply rooted cause of differences in opinion and conduct among men is the fact of racial peculiarities of temperament. It has been said concerning the Schism: "The more alien races of the remote East segregated themselves, incapable of either comprehending or approving the subtle changes advanced and advocated by the learned contingent of both Greeks and Romans. These two races, at first, closely knit by Arian blood ties, slowly diverged diametrically, as the one became infused with the vigorous blood of the invading Goths, and the other, with the more sluggish Slavs. From century to century, we discern more and more plainly the organizing and practical tendencies of the West, pushing forward to political preeminence; more and more pronounced became the philosophical and speculative tendencies of the East, holding with fervid intensity to custom and precedent — the West proudly winning the title of Catholic; the Eastern branch, as proudly defending the name of Orthodox."

A second cause for the Schism came from the rivalry between the Eastern and Western Empires as political organizations. When Constantine, in revulsion against the paganism of Rome, founded his capital at Constantinople on the Bosphorus, he started "a rift, doomed to widen into a schism." Jealousies and rivalries at once

led to most stringent guarding of power and privileges by each wing. But the See of Rome gradually gained supremacy in the West as "the sole protector of the Holy Faith" in ecclesiastical, as well as in military crises. Rome had never been more than nominally subject to the East; and when on Christmas day, A.D. 800, the Pope of Rome put the crown on the head of Charlemagne, the Frank, the break between the imperial power of the East and the West was completed.

The third cause that led to the permanent schism was a dispute concerning the seat of authority and final court of appeal. Both branches claimed direct descent from Apostolic times, and "to be the sole preserver of the Christian faith." In the year 1054 A.D. the conflict reached an acute stage; and the final rupture came when the papal legates from Rome formally laid on the altar of Saint Sophia a sentence of anathema denouncing the teachings of the Patriarch, Michael Cerularius. The anathema of the West was answered in terms of excommunication by the East. Michael then threw off all restraint. He rejected wholly the doctrine, discipline, and papal jurisdiction of Rome; he published an act excommunicating the whole Roman Church, and announced his freedom from allegiance to Rome by assuming the title of "the Universal Patriarch of the Orthodox Church of Christ." This cleavage in the Church caused by a struggle for power has persisted for nearly a thousand years. The two branches, the Greek and Roman, are still rival claimants "to be the sole holders of Christ's commission." Thus down the centuries, in the name of "Orthodoxy," the monopolistic spirit of men has held in check the growth of the democratic catholicity of the

Christ Who gave the command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every living creature."

Another heresy was broached by Berengarius, a native of France, in the year 1079 A.D. He began to dogmatize against second marriages, infant baptism, and the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. A second council of one hundred and fifty bishops convened at Rome, denounced the heretic, and made him throw his writings into the fire.

About the year 1385 appeared the arch-heretic, John Wyclif, styled "the Father of the Reformation." He attacked the rich and indolent churchmen. His doctrines were as follows: "A bishop or priest in a state of mortal sin can not ordain, consecrate, or baptise; the substance of the bread and wine remain in the sacrament after consecration, and the Christ is not really present therein; the Pope, if he be a wicked man, has no authority over the faithful; the clergy ought not to have temporal possessions; and auricular confession is unnecessary." Although accusations were brought against him, during his lifetime, Wyclif was not condemned as a heretic; but his followers, called Lollards, were persecuted as dangerous anarchists. On account of the great and lasting influence of his teachings, forty years after his death, by decree of the Roman Church, the body of John Wyclif was dug up and burned (1428). Tradition says that his ashes were thrown into a brook flowing into the Severn river. It is concerning this incident that Wordsworth wrote the lines:

> "The Avon to the Severn runs,
> The Severn to the sea;
> And Wyclif's dust shall spread abroad
> Wide as the waters be."

The influence of Wyclif's work will be considered in a later chapter.

Mohammedanism, which appeared in the seventh century, has been classified as a Christian heresy. With some consistency it may be so regarded, since in several respects the two systems resemble each other. Both faiths proclaim one God, and both are hostile to idolatry; both accept the Old and the New Testaments as divinely inspired; both make much of prayer; both teach rewards and punishments after death in a spirit world; and from the beginning, both have been missionary religions, carrying on world-wide propaganda.

Mohammedanism will receive further attention in a succeeding chapter.

CHAPTER IV

MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS

The origin of Monasticism is deeply buried in the mystery of the impenetrable past; but reports of asceticism, as accompaniments of the religions of Egypt, India, Syria, and all other countries are as old as is history itself. All monastic orders are said to have the same fundamental concept—"the mystical union of the human soul with God." Identified by its psychology, asceticism has been detected under a multiplicity of varied forms; for the conception of the relationship between man and his Maker has been variously modified at different stages of enlightenment among Christians themselves. For example, the beautiful idea of "practicing the presence of God" contrasts strongly with the helpless fear that seeks priestly ministrations "to propitiate an avenging Deity."

Christian asceticism has been defined by Webster as "the science which treats of the practice of the moral virtues and the counsels of perfection." Such a form of asceticism has usually expressed itself "in efforts to escape the contaminating influences of the animal passions and appetites; in contempt for matter, and in a struggle to keep the body under the control of the will."

The most exalted form of asceticism is mysticism, "the God-ward side of life." For centuries Christian mystics have attempted to connect themselves with the infinite

Power-house of energy, called God. The age-long effort of the human soul to seek companionship with its Creator has not yet ceased; but the present generation has devised more intelligent and practical forms of effort. Modern psychology abounds in evidences that the desire to discover the source of infinite power is becoming almost universal among the thoughtful classes; and the hope of "appropriating and feeding upon the Substance of infinite Intelligence" is said by some, "to be realized in a degree commensurate only with the proper effort." Going into the silence, or commanding "bodily stillness" is conceded to be in accordance with the spirit of asceticism that produced Monasticism and kept it for centuries at its highest level. As an illustration of modern mystical asceticism, I call to witness the following popular affirmation: "Oh God, Thou art not far off, but in the very center of my being. Thou art in me illumination, and through Thee, I know the truth which frees from all limitations of the body."

In the Christian Church attempts have been made by individuals to communicate with the spiritual Father in two different ways — either directly, without any priestly mediator, or through the ministrations of priestly intercessors. The concept of the need of a priestly intercessor is of pagan origin, and came into Christianity as a survival of Judaism. Through constant contact with pagan faiths, the idea of the Fatherhood of God, as taught by Jesus of Nazareth, was readily lost sight of and finally dropped out of the teachings of the Roman Church for centuries.

Resuming again the story of the Roman Church throughout the Middle Ages we find that the supposed necessity

for priestly intervention clothed the Roman priesthood with tremendous power. The mission of the Church was believed by all to be "to intercede with Christ and the Virgin Mary for the salvation of the souls of sinful men, and thus enable sinners to escape hell and gain heaven."

Finally, acts of self-expiating penance, as atonement for sin, were commanded by the priesthood; and the spiritual idea of the need of the purifying fire of Purgatory to fit the soul for companionship with angels, likewise, gave place to commercialized systems "of prayers for the dead."

Hence the fear of excommunication from the Roman Church, whose sacerdotalism furnished the only means for the salvation of the soul, readily secured the obedience of the laity to the commands of the priests, and laid the foundation for a system of priestcraft that existed in Europe for a thousand years.

It is not the purpose of the present discussion to condemn any age for its conceptions however absurd they may seem to a later generation, for there is an infancy of the race as of the individual. However, to the stratagems of a conscienceless priesthood who abused the most fundamental instincts of humanity, history directs attention.

The pages of history also disclose, in part, the retreats in which for centuries the Religion of the Spirit found lodgment. One of these sheltering resorts is found among the Monasteries. A full history of Monasticism is irrelevant to the subject in hand; for the spirit and purpose of Christian Monachism may be traced down the centuries by certain reforms instituted by master minds. We find that Monasticism, as an institution, dates from the fourth century. It had its beginning as a Christian institution

in the activities of Basil the Great, "the father of Christian Monasticism." When ignorance and vice were corrupting Roman society, and Eastern asceticism was about to extinguish the light of the Holy Spirit, this extraordinary man appeared upon the scene. Basil found monks clad in goat-skins and garments filled with dirt and vermin, unprotected from extremes of heat and cold. In order to propitiate a Deity whose attributes they wholly misunderstood, they were striving after an impossible perfection of character. By depriving themselves of nutritious food they were living under conditions fatal to all self-improvement and to life itself. When the habits of these ascetics fell under the notice of Basil, he felt it to be his special mission to correct them.

Basil's ancestors were honorable and wealthy; he had been educated in the best schools of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople; he had traveled extensively throughout the known world and had made the acquaintance of Athanasius, Julius, the Apostate Emperor of Rome, and also formed a famous friendship with a needed helper, Gregory Nazianzen. From his earliest youth, Basil had been devoted to learning and scorned Christianity. But when converted to the faith, the duty of parting with his "princely patrimony for the benefit of the poor" became clear and imperative. In order to effect the changes that he desired to see made in Monasticism, he studied under some famous hermit saints in order to learn from them how "to attain to an enthusiastic piety" and "how to keep his body under the control of his mind." Having acquired to his satisfaction the desired powers, he was soon at the head of a fraternity at Arnesi in Pontus.

There he was soon regarded as a true spiritual Father to a large company of men; the influence of his teachings has endured throughout the centuries; and his services to the Roman Church are now more justly estimated than at any previous time.

Knowing that the demons of passion have most power over men when they are alone and idle, he discouraged isolation among the monks. He pointed out the necessity for fellowship in order to reach "the beatific vision of God." Acquainted as he was with the habits of life among the rich and corrupted classes of his age, he recognized the necessity for a Christian protest against the enervating luxuries and vices of the times — a protest embodied in the three vows vital to all religious orders — poverty, chastity, and obedience.

One of the flagrant evils of his age (of all ages) was the excessive devotion to money-making in order to purchase sensual pleasures; hence, he required the monks to take the vow of poverty as an affirmation that "Money can not buy the higher joys of earthly life, nor secure the bliss of heaven after death."

From the lack of a central power in government the disintegration of society was threatened on every hand; laws were feebly enforced; and the mob was the order of the day in many communities. Hence obedience to law and authority, the first condition of civilized society, was made a cardinal virtue in the Monastery.

The vow of chastity was required as a protest against sexual impurity and laxity of the family life. Marriage was forbidden in order that the monks might attain greater sanctity when all the powers of body and mind

were fully concentrated on the attainment of the spiritual faculties; hence celibacy was made one of the fundamental requirements of convent life.

By organizing Monasticism, Basil made its asceticism less Oriental and more Christian in practice; he removed some of the conditions which lead to temptations, and provided other conditions necessary for spiritual growth at that time. That the rules of Basil were subsequently perverted and their original intentions destroyed, can not be charged with justice, either to the folly of Basil or to the worthlessness of the vows for the attainment of the object sought when they were enjoined.

A century later, that is, in the sixth century, another remarkable organizer, Saint Benedict, appeared upon the scene in the drama. Through the labors of Saint Benedict, Monasticism again received a new impulse from Christianity, and was again made less Oriental, fantastical, and visionary, and more practical and useful as a means of spiritual unfoldment by keeping the body under the control of the mind.

Saint Benedict founded the Monastery of Monte Casino, near Naples, in the year 529 A.D. His system became the model for all religious Orders of the West for several centuries. He re-affirmed all of the rules laid down by Basil, and undertook to enforce the vow of poverty, obedience, and chastity with greater strictness. The most important reform resulted from emphasis placed upon the necessity for useful and productive labor to provide for bodily necessities of men. He regarded industry and activity as one of the prime necessities, even of men who "forsake the pleasures of the world," for purposes of

making the higher spiritual attainments. He introduced into the Monastery the cultivation of land, the raising of cattle, and all domestic animals, and all of the known arts of agriculture. The convents became centers of industry where wealth was produced and accumulated — not for the use of the individual monk, but for the sacred order. Another feature of the reforms undertaken by Saint Benedict was the introduction of the spirit of fraternity and hospitality. The Order of Benedict erected stately buildings where monks entertained strangers and gave shelter to the persecuted and miserable among all classes. For centuries their precincts were regarded as sacred enclosures, free from scandal and worthy of high respect.

The most flourishing days of the Benedictine Orders were from the sixth to the eleventh centuries. During these intervening years, vast abbey churches were built, and abbots became temporal as well as great spiritual magnates. Of the various Orders of the Benedictines, there have been in all, not less than thirty-seven thousand monasteries, and one hundred and fifty thousand abbots. From the monks of the Benedictines, two thousand bishops and arch-bishops have been chosen; and twenty-eight of these have been elevated to the papal throne. But the day of their great numerical strength became also the day of their great moral weakness.

History records the sad story that in the tenth century they touched the lowest point of human degeneracy. They broke all their vows; they lived for themselves rather than for others, and for this world rather than for the world to come. Monasticism finally became thoroughly institutionalized, and as other institutions with perfunctory dis-

cipline, it began to decline. The failure of the Benedictine Order has been ascribed to three main causes: the raids of the Northmen; the growth of the Feudal system, making abbots secular lords; and the seizure of Monastic revenues by both kings and bishops. Strange to contemplate, the Monastery which had pledged to a life of poverty and had kept the vow for centuries, finally absorbed the wealth of nations; and monks who had taken the vow of obedience to authority, became despotic rulers over nobles, princes, kings, and emperors; and friars who had taken the vow of chastity became the worst of gluttons and sensualists. Yet the degeneracy of the Benedictines can not be charged with justice either to the mistakes of Saint Benedict, or to the worthlessness of the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience as a means of character-building at the time when enjoined.

In the midst of the state of degeneracy of the Benedictine Order, arose another reformer, Saint Bernard, the most representative of ideal monks of all time. He was born in the year 1091 at Fontain, Burgundy, France. At the age of twenty-two, he entered the Monastery of Clairvau, where he was regarded as a saint, and soon became an abbot. His intellectual activities and his force of character were as marked as his piety. Though frail of body, he awakened the minds of the age, and ruled all Europe by the power of his learning and piety. He entered into all of the theological controversies of his day; he opposed Abelard, the rationalist; and incited the princes of Europe to undertake the Crusades. He was a great orator, and became the greatest oracle of an age that believed in "an eternal physical Hell of bodily torment in

literal fire and brimstone." Yet he was a moral reformer, and denounced the gluttony of monks, the avarice of popes, and the rapacity of princes. He possessed a master mind, and made his own age more intellectual and moral. But great as he was, he could not emancipate himself from the depressing ideas that ruled his age and his Order — the gloomy dread of the world to come which hung like a shadow over men.

Passing on at once to the thirteenth century, we find that the Benedictines have become too numerous, wealthy, and institutionalized to be capable of further reformation. They have now become a scandal to the Roman Church, and have lost the respect and confidence of good men. The Crusades have now opened to the eyes of all Europe a much wider horizon. Everything has been built upon a larger foundation and taken on new colors. The universities have grown up around the Cathedral schools. Minds given to meditation are now equipped for inquiry into the great theological questions. The Schoolmen have arisen. The Saracens have made Christianity acquainted with the teachings of Plato and the methods of Aristotle. Popes are needing more active partisans to sustain their own supremacy over the State. In order to meet the needs of the times, two new orders of friars have arisen called Mendicants — the Dominicans and the Franciscans. The Mendicants, founded by Dominic Guzeman, were to minister to the needs of the nobility. The Franciscans, founded by Francis of Assisi, ministered to the needs of the common people and made bold attempts to democratize the Roman Church. As is suggested by the name, Mendicants, the new movement was intended to be a protest

against usurpations on the part of the wealth-loving monasteries, and a re-affirmation of the vows of poverty. When the monks could not earn their own living they were to humiliate themselves by begging their bread as they wandered from place to place to preach the gospel, and to do good to their fellow-men.

The new Orders of Mendicants were composed of men zealous, and truly pious. Their preaching kindled a new life among the people as they wandered far and wide, without choice of locality, at the command of their superiors. The great ornaments of the Mendicant Orders were the Schoolmen, Albertus Magnus, Benaventura, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and Roger Bacon who paved the way for the thinkers who ushered in the Reformation.

But unfortunately, the Mendicants also broke their vows; and in less than a century they were bitterly reproached for their vagabond habits. They catered to the wishes of the great, and in service of ecclesiastical usurpers, were chosen "to sell indulgences." They are said to have invented "pious frauds;" and under the pretense of poverty, they became covetous; they usurped the prerogatives of the parish priests, as they wandered about and fattened and grew rich on the credulity of the faithful. It was the Mendicant friars — the Dominicans and Franciscans — against whom Chaucer hurled the darts of ridicule; it was the Mendicants whose vices Wyclif denounced; and it was the Mendicants from whom Luther (an Augustinian monk) made his memorable revolt. (The Jesuits, a product of the sixteenth century, will be considered under the discussion of the Second Constructive Period.)

There has been so much of both unquestioned good and

evil in Monastic institutions, that their relation and value to Christianity have been warmly debated; and their champions and their opponents have alike found ample material for discussion and difference of opinion. It must be conceded, however, that historic criticism of today is viewing Monasticism in a new light. Concerning Monasticism, the Encyclopaedia Brittanica contains the following: "Few phenomena are more striking than the change that has come over educated Protestants in the estimate of Monasticism. The older Protestants uncompromisingly judged the monastic ideal and life as both un-Christian and unnatural, as absolute perversion of the spiritual religion of Catholic Christianity, deserving nothing but the severest condemnation. But now the view of the critico-historical school of Protestantism, of which Dr. Adolph Harnack, is the representative spokesman, is that the preservation of spiritual religion has been mainly, if not wholly, due to Monasticism."

Upon the same subject, John Lord has said: "As a Medieval institution, Monasticism conferred many benefits on semi-barbarous Europe. As a whole, considering the shadows of ignorance and superstition which veiled Christendom, and the evils which violence produced, its influence was beneficial.

"Among the benefits which Monastic institutions conferred, at least, indirectly, may be mentioned the counteracting influences they exerted against the turbulence and tyranny of baronial lords, whose arrogance and extortions they rebuked; they befriended the peasantry; they enabled poor boys to rise; they defended the doctrine that the instructors of mankind should be taken from all classes

alike; they were democratic in their sympathies, while feudal life produced haughtiness and scorn; and they welcomed scholars from the humblest ranks; they beheld in peasants' children, souls that should be ennobled. Monachism recognized what feudalism did not — the claim of man as man. In this respect it was human and sympathetic. It furnished a retreat from misery and oppression. It favored contemplative habits and the passive virtues, so much needed in turbulent times. Whatever faults monks had, it must be admitted that they relieved suffering, and presented the only consolation that their gloomy and iron age offered. In an imperfect manner, their convents answered the purpose of our modern hotels, hospitals, and schools. It was benevolence, charity, and piety which the monks aimed to secure, and which they often succeeded in diffusing among a people more wretched and ignorant than themselves."

Concerning the value of Monasticism, Professor A. C. Mac Giffert has said in the *Hibbert Journal* (July, 1813) the following: "Nearly all the important reformations in the history of the Roman Church began in Monasticism. Fortunately for the Church, it had the good sense to recognize the legitimacy of the new movement and to place its stamp of approval upon it, thus preventing it from becoming a dangerous rival or a fatal enemy. Over and over again new Orders arose, or new chapters of existing orders were formed, meeting better than the old the needs and aspirations of this or that monk or group of monks. Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, and Jesuits — all of these served Catholicism as so many different forms of religion, enabling the Church to retain

within its folds the most devout and earnest spirits. Deprived of Monasticism, the Catholic Church must have split to pieces long ago. The outlet offered by the Monastery for the individual religious life was one of the secrets of the century-long existence of a single Catholic Church in western Europe.''

It is readily seen that at its best Christian Monachism combines the two fundamental requirements for all spiritual growth among men — leisure and solitude for deep meditation, joined with the fellowship of community life.

In the last analysis, it is usually conceded that if Christianity is to make good its claim to be the absolute and universal religion, it must provide in some manner for the expression of the deep and universal desire of the soul that Monasticism recognizes and displays — the awakening and preservation of ''the God-consciousness in the human soul.''

ERRATUM

The date in the second line of paragraph on Page 54 should be *1913* instead of 1813.

CHAPTER V

MOHAMMEDANISM

Nothing could have seemed more improbable to the Christians of the seventh century than that the Saracens, or Arabs, a Semitic people, would ever make a triumphant entrance into history as victors over the Greeks, Persians, and Egyptians. Yet such was the case when Mohammedanism gained its ascendency among the nations. The story of the rise and progress of Islam reads like a piece of fiction — like one of the impossible tales of the Arabian Nights. Yet Islam came, saw, and conquered, and is a fact to be reckoned with today as it was thirteen centuries ago. For this reason an epitome of the remarkable story of Mohammedanism and the atrocities of the Crusades undertaken to check the "unspeakable Turk," the Mussulman, has been introduced into this study of Christianity.

As stated in a foregoing chapter, Mohammedanism was for a long time regarded as a Christian sect. That so strange a departure from the spirit and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth could have secured such abundant success in gaining adherents as to be regarded today as one of the great religions of the world, seems strange indeed. Yet it is not more surprising than are many other transformations of Christianity — for example, the perversions of Romanism in South America; the polygamy of Mormonism in the United States; the anti-Christ of Christians

who today are upholding the military system as the best means of settling international disputes — all these and many other un-Christian practices in society.

In the study of the life of Mohammed we will consider first, the man; second, his teachings; and last the fruitage of his statesmanship.

In reviewing the biography of the Prophet of Allah, we find that he was a well-born man, thoroughly prepared for a great work to which he felt himself to have been divinely called. His birth in the year 570 A.D. occurred in an aristocratic family which, though poor, was entrusted with the keeping of "the Black Stone," the object of idolatrous veneration in the pagan temples of Arabia. Here he was able to see and to feel the degrading effects of idolatry. Early in life, he became a firm believer in one God, a Supreme Intelligence whose laws can not be violated with impunity. This sublime view of the Creator and His dominion over men was his first qualification for performing a great work. Although left an orphan at the age of six, he was well cared for by an uncle, a merhcant with whom he made long journeys to distant lands. He was also fortunate in marriage with a wealthy widow, Cadijeh, who strove to forward his fortunes. It has been said, "Without the companionship and sympathy and faith of Cadijeh, he probably would have failed. He told her and her alone his dreams, his ecstacies, his visions; how that God at different times had sent prophets and teachers to reveal new truths by which religion had been restored; how this one God who created the heavens and the earth had never left Himself without witnesses of His truth in the most degenerate times; how that the universal

recognition of this sovereign Power and Providence was necessary to the salvation of society; and how his soul burned to tell his countrymen his belief in a Living God to whom alone prayer should be made."

It has often been said that Mohammed was unable either to read or write. Be that as it may, he had studied the needs of men, and knew that the idea of a living God was necessary for the spiritual awakening and progress of his own countrymen. He claimed to have been commissioned by a personal conversation with the Arch-Angel, Gabriel, to raise the Arabs above idolatry and to reform the abuses of Judaism and Christianity among the Syrians with whom he had come into frequent contact.

He did not, however, undertake his great work until his fortieth year when all his natural and acquired powers were at full maturity. His activities covering the last twenty-four years of his life may be divided into two periods, corresponding to his two great achievements — those of a Prophet, and those of a warrior-statesman. The thirteen years of his life preceding the Hegira, or his flight to Medina, July 16th, 622 A.D., he devoted to the development of his system as a personal religion; and the remaining eleven years of his life he employed in transforming his religion into a national faith which he applied to the nationalization of Arabia.

During the first period of his ministrations he employed only instruction and persuasion in his efforts to make converts to his spiritual view-point. He told his people that the living God, Allah, is the only reality. And since Allah made us and sustains us, "in submission to Him lies our whole strength." He denounced idolatry which entails

the direst calamities as treason to Allah. The fundamental idea with which he started was, "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is His prophet."

During the first period of activities, he wrote the Koran, formulated his creed, and enjoined his religious practices. The Islam creed contains the following tenets: "I believe in God, in the Angels, in the Books (the Pentateuch of Moses, the Psalms of David, the Gospels of Christ and the Koran of Mohammed), in the Apostles, in the Last Day, in the Decrees of the Almighty, both as to good and evil, and in the Resurrection of the dead." The five practices which he enjoined as duty are as follows: "Frequent repetition of the formula there is no God but Allah and Mohammed is his prophet; the reciting of prayers five times daily; fasting at appointed times; alms-giving, usually confined to fellow Mohammedans; and a pilgrimage to Mecca — at least once in a life-time."

Mohammed has frequently been called both a heretic and a hypocrite; but there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of his convictions and his faith in himself as "the latest and greatest of the prophets." He faced much opposition with a courage that could come from nothing but deep conviction. When the keepers of the temple were seeking his life, because he had destroyed the value of the three hundred and sixty-five idols; and when his kinsmen urged him to abandon his undertaking, he replied: "Though they should set the sun on my right hand and the moon on my left, to persuade me, I would hold my place and declare there is but one God; and while Allah commands me, I will not renounce my purposes." Thus we find his excellent equipment for his work was faith

in a supreme Being, faith in a good cause, and faith in himself as a divinely appointed instrument for performing a great work.

Let us look at the condition of the Arabic tribes whom he converted from idolatry and organized into a great nation. The Arabs were just emerging from ancestor worship, and held as sacred no tie but that of blood. By the limiting ties of blood, the people were divided into hostile tribes; and of the cohesive principles of patriotism and nationalism they had no conception.

Mohammed's monotheism gave him the ideal of unity among men, and the desire to make out of the hostile tribes a real nation became the ruling passion of his life. He also knew that the foundation of national unity must be broader than that of family and tribe. Hence he hoped to nationalize the tribes through the fellowship engendered by a common religious faith. It is said that he hoped to prove that "It is by a religious faith held in common, and not by ties of blood, that nations are formed." But the religion of Islam did not attract the idolatrous Arabic tribes. They had little inclination to pray, to read the Koran, and to give alms. They were unable to understand the value of the message, and they murdered the missionaries sent to teach them the new faith and practice of a spiritual religion. After years of teaching and preaching, opposition to the faith was growing stronger and stronger. Then Mohammed resorted to the sword. At the hour when the settled purpose to unite the tribes by the use of the sword took possession of him, the warrior statesman was born.

The use of the sword marks the beginning of the second

period of his achievements — the consolidation of Arabia, and the nationalization of the Islam faith.

It is generally supposed that it cost the Arabs little struggle to cast away their idols; for idolatry, the religion of the childhood of the world, was dead. They longed for something better, they knew not what. But they demanded as a condition of allegiance to Mohammed that he perform miracles in the name of Allah. This he did, and he did it with the sword. They soon discovered that "No might could withstand the sword of Allah." Then they began to respect the Moslems, who, in spite of small numbers, could defy whole tribes — yes, all the tribes. When one of the chiefs surrendered to the Moslem warriors, negotiations were effected by Moslem elders; and the populace was not consulted as to their religious preferences. Hence, the change of faith in Arabia was effected by treaties following victories in battle, and the religious practices of Islam were enforced by the sword.

We find that Mohammed built upon human nature just as he found it. He employed expediency and catered to the lower nature of his people. Nor is this appeal to be condemned; for he turned their martial spirit (which he could not subdue) to good account in establishing the Kingdom of Allah in Arabia. And whatever judgment we may pass upon the motives and methods of the Prophet of Allah, we are compelled to admit that he was a great reformer whose labors are enduring. We readily assent to the opinion that fellowship in a common religion is a higher principle than the instinctive unity belonging to blood alone; we recognize patriotism as a sentiment in advance of tribal exclusiveness and hostility; we believe

that monotheism is a higher form of religion than idolatrous polytheism; and we realize that loyalty to a Spiritual Being (by whatever name known) produces an abiding sense of spiritual union among men.

The posthumous influence of Mohammed today is greater than that of any one man since the Fall of the Roman Empire. Without doubt, Mohammed believed in the righteous use of the sword; for he said: "Paradise will be found in the shadow of the crossing of the sword; and whosoever fights for the true faith, whether he fall or conquer, will assuredly receive the great reward. The sword is the key to heaven." Full of courage, enthusiasm, and devotion to Allah, he aroused in his followers a like devotion to his cause. The Arabs were a pleasure-loving people. Mohammed promised to the victors of the faith a Paradise of Bliss. The rewards offered for service of Allah were exactly what their minds understood and their souls craved. They hoped to earn "A Paradise of unending youth, in lands of crystal waters, in sumptuous palaces, clad in garments of gold, and attended by maidens free from all defects, and rejoicing in perpetual charms."

In all lands and in all ages, material success attracts adherents to any cause and to any faith. As tribe after tribe and nation after nation yielded to the followers of the warrior-statesman, a more convincing argument in favor of the new religion arose from the logic of events. To the hope of future rewards in a spirit-land, was added also the present enjoyment of rich booty, the spoils of war. As the Jews had wished Jesus of Nazareth to establish an earthly kingdom, so the Saracens craved conquest and dominion; and Mohammed secured for them the satisfac-

tion of their natural longing for supremacy. Caring naught for what others thought of their methods, and believing that for the victors were immediate and abundant success and heavenly bliss throughout eternity, Islam went forth to conquer the world for Allah. Before the close of his life Mohammed had subdued by the sword all of the scattered tribes of Arabia, destroyed their idols, created a new nation, and given them the religion of Islam.

After his death his disciples, called Moslem and Mussulmen, followed up the triumphs of the new faith by a continued use of the sword for the purpose of making Islam the world-religion. They offered the vanquished the alternative of making Islam their religion or of suffering death; and the advantage of an outward change of faith was immediately perceived. They soon captured Palestine, and Jerusalem was compelled to open her gates to Omar, the caliph. Within a single century, Persia was subdued and the religion of Zoroaster nearly extinguished. Egypt was invaded, the city of Alexandria (once rife with metaphysical discussions) was captured, and the priceless library of the Ptolemies, containing seven hundred thousand volumes of manuscripts, was totally destroyed upon the principle, "If the manuscripts agree with the Koran, they are useless; if they disagree, they should be destroyed."

Spain also was conquered, and the Mohammedan leaders boasted that they would enter Rome and destroy Christianity. However, this they did not accomplish. Charles Martel, the leader of the Franks, checked "these fearless riders of the desert" on the memorable plane of Tours, and they never again ventured beyond the Pyrenees Mountains. After a single century, Saracenic rule extended

from the Indus river on the east, to the Pyrenees Mountains on the west, and everywhere proclaimed the Islam faith in the name of Mohammed, "the latest and the greatest of the Prophets."

It is important to note that after the conquest was completed, the caliphs mitigated the sentence of death or the acceptance of the Islam faith. With the exception of gross idolatry they granted a large measure of tolerance to all other faiths. And after the caliphs abandoned the practice of persecution, they required the payment of tribute money by the conquered nations. This levy served to enrich their capital, Bagdad. After a few generations, the war-loving spirit of the Arabs changed into a love for the arts of peace. At the time when Charlemagne was waging war in Europe, Bagdad had become the home of poets, scientists, and men of great learning.

A rival caliphate of Bagdad was that of Cordova, Spain. The Moors, as the Mohammedans were called in Spain, erected magnificent structures whose graudeur is attested today by the ruins of the Palace of Alhambra. Amid the ignorance which enveloped Europe during the Dark Ages, the Saracenic Empire which extended from Mongolia to Spain and Egypt was dotted with schools which attracted students from all parts of the known world. A library at Cairo, Egypt, is said to have numbered one hundred thousand manuscripts — one-seventh the number destroyed at the City of Alexandria. The inductive method of Aristotle was adopted in their disputations, and scientific experimentations were pushed into almost every line of investigation.

At the death of Mohammed, Islam became divided into

two hostile sects which have persisted, and today are still separated by bitter hatred of each other. One faction is called Shyites and claims that the Prophet had designated his nephew, Ali, as his successor and that therefore he and his successors only are the rightful holders of authority. As a matter of fact, Ali was thrust aside and three Caliphs, Abuker, Omar, and Othman assumed authority. Their followers were called Sunnites, because, besides accepting the Koran, they accepted the Sunna, or the traditions of their religion. The Sunnites predominate in Arabia, Turkey, and the North of Africa. They are the most numerous and call themselves "Orthodox Islam." The Shyites have their main seat in Persia where their religion is adopted as the state faith.

From the beginning, Islam was a political as well as a religious institution; for both their civil and religious laws were derived from the teachings of the Koran and the Sunna, and the Mohammedans make no distinction between temporal and spiritual power. But as the conquests of the Saracens extended, their states finally became disunited. Spain, Egypt, Morocco, India, and other geographical divisions had separate sovereigns who regarded the Caliphs of Bagdad, the successors of the Prophet Allah, as having no temporal jurisdiction, and the question remained an open one in theory. Thus politics and religion parted company in Mohammedan territory without an open contest with the civil rulers of the conquered nations. This ready dissolution of politics and religion (or Church and State) is supposed to be due to the fact that Mohammedanism has no priesthood standing between God and the congregation of worshipers. They have, however, a class of

professional theologians whose influence over the masses is enormous — so great as to have hardly a parallel in the history of any other religion.

Whether we regard Mohammedanism as one of the heretical sects of Christianity or do not, modern Islam comprises one-sixth of the population of the world and represents a great army of not less than two hundred millions of souls gathered under the banner of the Crescent. Space forbids a more extended consideration of the Mohammedans. For the present, we bid adieu to Islam to meet her again in battle array on a field of blood, whence she sprang into power and glory.

CHAPTER VI

THE CRUSADES

The Crusades which represented the ideas, passions, and superstitions of the Roman Church during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, are, it is often said, "more worthy of study than any thing else that took place during the Middle Ages." They were, as historically developed, an admixture of many motives and interests, and were fraught with many consequences. They represented religious zeal and veneration for a spot made sacred by the sufferings of the Christ; they laid the foundation for Chivalry; they affected Monastic life; they helped to secure the dominion of Popes; they determined the birth of states; they contributed to the progress of commerce, science, and all of the known arts. "Grasp the Crusades," says John Lord, " and you comprehend the forces that underlay the institutions of the Middle Ages and ushered in a new civilization."

For the purpose of the present discussion, we will consider, as briefly as possible, some of the causes and the effects of "the Holy Wars." The most apparent and immediate cause of the Crusades is found in a prevailing superstition of the age — the hope of propitiating Deity by acts of penance. Near the close of the tenth century there was great suffering in Europe — arising, as is now believed, from immorality and unhygienic living. The

calamities of life were so great, that according to the judgment of the sufferers, the end of the world seemed near at hand. While the Mohammedans were sustained by the hope of reward for valiant deeds, universal fear of impending Divine wrath seized the minds of the Christians — especially in Germany, France, and England. In accordance with the prevailing sentiment of the age, every means of averting the anger of God and escaping the flames of Hell-fire were employed; but the most approved form of penance was a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Long and painful as was the journey from Europe to the Holy Land, many undertook to visit the alleged Sepulchre of the Savior in the Holy City, then under the dominion of the Turks. After traveling thousands of miles, and amid dangers and hardships most terrible, they were not allowed to enter Jerusalem without the payment of tribute money. Sometimes the pilgrims were forcibly excluded from the city; sometimes, after gaining admittance, they were exposed to the rigors of Turkish cruelty; sometimes they were loaded with chains and compelled to draw carts and plows; and some were condemned to ignominious death. Each returning palmer told fresh tales of horrors.

The spirit of the Crusades was introduced into the minds of the masses of the people of Europe by Peter the Hermit, a monk of France, who visited Jerusalem in the year 1095 A.D. Stirred by what he saw, he resolved to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the Turks. A council was called at Cleremont, France. After Peter the Hermit had addressed the assemblage of bishops, Pope Urban II delivered a most animated discourse favoring the enterprise. He concluded with the words, "Go now

and take the sword of the Macabees, protect the people of God, and defend your persecuted brethren against the implacable enemies of Christianity. Mussulman impiety has overspread the fairest regions of Asia. Ephesus, Nicea, and Antioch have become Mohammedan cities. The barbarous hordes of the Turks have planted their colors on the very shores of the Hellespont. Hence they threaten war to all of the states of Christendom. Unless you oppose a mighty barrier to their triumphant course, how can Europe be saved from invasion and the curse of Mohammedanism?''

The foregoing expresses the spirit and explains the circumstances that called the Crusades into being. The immediate cause for undertaking the First Crusade was the desire to wrest the Holy Sepulchre from the Turks; but the permanent and undefined cause that lasted as a motive for two centuries was the antagonism between the two rival religions, Christianity and Mohammedanism.

The enthusiasm manifested at Cleremont diffused itself through all Europe with incredible swiftness. With bare head and dressed in a coarse robe tied with a cord, bearing a crucifix, and riding upon an ass, Peter the Hermit traversed all Europe. Under the spell of his fancy and frenzy thousands volunteered for the Holy War, and fastened upon their garments the Red Cross — the symbol of their sacred vow to exterminate the Turks. Sovereigns and nobles, princes and peasants, animated alike by a kindred feeling, began to make preparations for the East — domestic quarrels and private animosities were forever buried in oblivion.

''As a prelude to the First Crusade,'' says the historian

Barnes, "Peter the Hermit and a poor knight, named Walter the Penniless, set off with a motley rabble of three hundred thousand men, women, and children. Without order or discipline, they crossed Europe, robbed the inhabitants and killed Jews wherever they went. So great was the enthusiasm that men took their families with them in carts drawn by oxen. Children carrying mimic swords sported about and shouted whenever they saw a castle or a town, 'Isn't that Jerusalem?' Thousands of the fanatical crowd were slain en route by the outraged people whom they attacked on the journey. The pitiable remnant fell beneath the Turkish sabers and their bleached bones served to fortify the camp of the Second Crusade."

The next Crusade, which numbered in its ranks a million men, was led by Godfry, Duke of Bouillon, and was reduced to twenty thousand men when they reached Jerusalem. At that time the Holy City was held by the Saracenic Caliph of Egypt; and forty days were required to pull down the Crescent and put up the Cross. In the process, the Crusaders assassinated seventy thousand infidels and Jews in their synagogues. And unmindful of the loving kindness of the Master whose tomb was held so sacred, while the streets still ran red with blood, the palmers entered the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, sang hymns of praise and partook of the communion in the name of the Christ, the Prince of Peace.

The victorious Crusaders divided the kingdoms of Jerusalem and Syria into four states. After a period of prosperity, jealousies and divisions arose among the Christian princes, and the Mohammedans took advantage of these dissensions and threatened the destruction of the

Christian kingdom of the East. In their time of trouble, the Christians of Palestine solicited aid from the princes of all Europe. After the arrival of deputies sent from Syria to Saint Bernard, who espoused the cause by preaching the necessity for it, a new Crusade was undertaken. A half century had elapsed since the close of the former war, and the people were ready to renew the activities that had appealed so strongly to their forbears. In response to the appeal of Saint Bernard and others, Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany set out with three hundred thousand men. Queen Elinor, clad in knightly array and leading a band of women, accompanied Louis VII. Conrad III was accompanied also by a band of women, called "the Golden Footed Dames." After a series of disappointments they reached Damascus, where they were beaten back by the enemy and were compelled to abandon the Crusade in humiliation.

After the lapse of forty years (1189), when the Egyptian Sultan, Saladin, chief of Moslem warriors, had taken Jerusalem, a Third Crusade was undertaken. All Europe was convulsed with grief, fear, and indignation. Fredric Barbarosa of Germany undertook to lead a magnificent Hungarian army across the country, but was drowned in a swollen stream in Asia Minor. Philip Augustus of France, Richard Coeur de Lion, of England, accompanied by a large army, attempted to convey their troops by sea. In a fit of jealousy, Philip deserted the cause. Richard pressed on and reached a hill whence he could see Jerusalem twenty miles away. He had not the courage to make the attack alone; and he turned his face toward home, calling himself unworthy to view the Sepulchre of Christ.

A Fourth Crusade was undertaken in the year 1202 A.D. The army consisted of Frenchmen and Germans. The crusaders sailed, not for Jerusalem, but for Constantinople, where a Latin Empire had been established, and where they hoped to reunite the Eastern and Western churches; but in vain. The attempt failed in both of its purposes.

Ten years later took place the Children's Crusade which well represents the wild folly of the times. Thirty thousand French boys, led by a peasant youth named Stephen, started to do what so many armies of men had failed to do. After innumerable hardships, they reached Marseilles, where they were induced by traders to take ship; they were then treacherously sold as slaves to the Saracens in Africa.

The Sixth Crusade (1228) was a pacific one. By a treaty with the Sultan of Turkey, Frederick II of Germany freed Jerusalem and Bethlehem from the Moslems.

The Seventh Crusade (1249) and the Eighth (1270) were conducted by Saint Louis. In his first expedition, he was taken prisoner in Egypt and ransomed by his countrymen at a high price. In his second expedition he went to Tunis with the hope of making a convert of the Mohammedans; but instead of doing so he found a grave in a foreign land. With the passing of Saint Louis, who preferred to convert his enemies rather than to murder them, the spirit of the Crusades also expired.

The causes that led to the discontinuance of the Crusades are given by Guizot in the following language: "It is often said that Europe was weary of those inroads upon Asia. We must come to understand the meaning of the word

weary frequently used in this connection. It is exceedingly incorrect to say so. It is not true that generations of mankind can be weary of what was done, not by themselves; that they can be weary by the fatigue of their fathers. Weariness is personal; it can not be transmitted like an inheritance. The people of the thirteenth century were not weary of the Crusades of the twelfth century; they were simply influenced by different causes and motives. A great change had come in opinions, sentiments, and social relations; there were no longer the same desires or wants; the people no longer believed in the same things. It was on account of the moral and political changes that the differences in the conduct of successive generations can be explained. They neither desired nor needed the Crusades. They had been thrown into wars by the impulses of a religious spirit and energy; by the exclusive dominion of religious ideas; but this dominion had lost its force. They had sought in the Crusades a new way of life, of a less confined and more varied description; but they began to find this in Europe itself in the progress of social relations. It was at this time that kings began to see the road to political aggrandizement. Why go to Asia in search of kingdoms, when there were kingdoms to conquer at their very door? The road to wealth was now open to them, and they gave up adventure for industry. Adventurers were replaced for sovereigns by political projects; for people, by industry on a large scale. On the one hand was the extension of ideas and the emancipation of the mind and the enrichment of thought; on the other hand, a general enlargement of the social sphere and the opening for a wider field of activities."

Our chief concern in this present discussion is the discovery of the effect of the Crusades upon the Roman Church. We find that the popes were led into the Crusades and thereby their personal influence was greatly increased. The departing crusaders received special privileges from the priests, and the person and property of the crusaders were supposed to be under the immediate protection of the Church. As Mohammed had rewarded his followers, so popes used material influences to arouse the desire for war, relaxed moral law, and turned aside from the spirit of the Christ. Monasteries that in the past had been the conservators of all that is enobling, became now rich and corrupt. Many knights willed their estates to the neighboring convents, and as few of them returned from the East, the Monasteries acquired vast wealth, which led to the breaking of all their vows.

The Crusades had an effect also upon the masses of the people. As the Europeans came in contact with the more polished people of the East, they gained in refinement and culture. As has been previously stated, the Saracens, once a warlike people, had changed in their character with the passing of the centuries, and had gained great love for the arts of peace. Bagdad had become the home of learning. The Saracenic Empire had become dotted with schools; and while the Christians of Europe were enveloped in ignorance during the Dark Ages, the Saracens had come to understand the laws of falling bodies, specific gravity, the general principles of heat and light, mechanical powers, and many other things of value to material civilization. They applied the pendulum to the reckoning of time; measured the earth; made catalogues

of the stars; and gave algebra and geometry their modern form; and they brought into Europe the manufacture of cotton goods and the printing of calico with wooden blocks. It has been said, "The Crusades repaid the common people for all their expenditures and loss of life by what they acquired in the way of civilization gained from contact with their enemy."

Also a new motive for action was introduced into Christianity; previous wars had been undertaken for conquest; but those engaged in the Crusades fought for an idea. The religious enthusiasm engendered by the desire to rescue the Holy Sepulchre gave the masses of the people something to battle for outside of their own petty self-interests; and not only outside of their own feudal estates, but outside of their own country and their own continent. As Islam had united the hostile tribes of Arabia and had set them the task of making Islam a world-religion by might and power, so the Crusades undertook to repel the Mussulmen, and unite the people of Europe in a common cause that enlarged their thoughts and their interests.

The Crusades thus brought about social and political revolutions. They both removed evils and conferred benefits. The masses of the Europeans were chained to the soil by the feudal system. They possessed neither property, knowledge, nor personal freedom. Only the churchmen and the nobles deserved the name of citizens. "From the period of the Crusades," says Gibbon, "the common people began to acquire rights, and what is more, to defend them. A new religious, moral, and intellectual impulse was given to all classes of society. Christianity owes its knowledge of Latin and Greek literature to the Arabians who had

translated these classic languages into their own tongues; and from Mohammedan teachers the Roman Church first gained knowledge of the teachings of Plato and Aristotle. It is well attested that when the Christians set out upon the Crusades, they regarded all Mohammedans as barbarians unworthy of Christian tolerance; but before they returned, many of them made the discovery that the barbarians were chiefly among themselves."

Concerning the characteristics of the Crusades, Guizot has said: "Their first characteristic is their universality; all Europe concurred in them; they were the first European event. Before the Crusades, Europe had never been moved by the same sentiment, or acted in a common cause; till then, in fact, Europe did not exist. The Crusades made manifest the existence of Christian Europe. The French formed the main body of the army of crusaders; but there were also Germans, Italians, Spaniards, and English in the ranks. But look at the second and third crusades and we will find that all the nations of Christendom were engaged in them. The world had never before witnessed a similar combination. But this is not all. In the same manner as the Crusades were European events, so in each separate nation, they were national events. In every nation, all classes of society were animated with the same impressions, yielded to the same ideas, and abandoned themselves to the same impulses. Kings, nobles, priests, citizens, country people — all took the same interest and share in the Crusades. The moral unity of nations was thus made manifest; a fact as new as the unity of Europe."

"The principal effect of the Crusades," continues Guizot, "was a great step toward the emancipation of the mind, a

great progress toward enlarged and liberal ideas. Though being under the name and influence of religious belief, the Crusades deprived religious ideas of their despotic and exclusive possession of the human mind. The result, though doubtless unforeseen, arose from various causes. At first, evidently, the novelty, extent, and variety of the scenes displayed themselves to the crusaders; what generally happens to travelers, happened to them. It is a mere common-place to say that traveling gives freedom of mind; that the habit of observing different nations, different manners, and different opinions enlarges the ideas and disengages the judgment from old prejudices. The same thing happened to those nations of travelers who have been called the crusaders that happens to other travelers; their minds were opened and raised by having seen a multitude of different things, by having become acquainted with other manners than their own. They found themselves placed in connection with two states of civilization, not only different from their own, but more advanced — the Greek state of society on the one hand, and the Mussulman on the other. Thus we see that the Crusades produced at the same time, more individual freedom and more political unity. They tended to increase both independence in men and the centralization of society."

CHAPTER VII

THE PAPAL EMPIRE

Some of the most tragic scenes enacted in the Roman Church have concerned the relation of the Popes of Rome to the Catholic Church, and the relationship between Church and State.

Popery also presents two aspects. The one phase is a natural spiritual supremacy resulting from the use of mental and moral means to direct thought and activities; the other form of supremacy arose from political authority and the use of military power.

When the Roman Empire fell (476 A.D.) there was little left as the heritage of the Church except the ideas of organization and absolute power. These two ideas fostered the growth of imperialism in the Roman Church.

The causes that combined to give to the See of Rome supremacy over the older Sees of Antioch and Alexandria in the organization of the Imperial Church under Constantine are not difficult to discover. For, during the existence of the Roman Empire, the Western nations had become accustomed to look to Rome for political guidance; a natural attachment to "the proud City of the Soul" endured for a long time. Therefore Roman ideas of organization were preserved and realized in the Imperial Church. "The religious life of the individual," says Prof. A. C. MacGiffert, "whether Christian or something else, could

never have produced such an institution as the Roman Catholic Church. Roman absolutism, Roman genius for government, and Roman laws were exhibited in it and commanded assent by their very masterfulness."

Furthermore, the supremacy of the Pope of Rome rests upon the assumption of "his direct Apostolic descent and divine appointment as sole holder of Christ's commission." It was asserted that there is an unbroken continuity of Roman primacy from Apostolic times down to the present day. According to the tradition (set forth as authentic history in the third century) the Apostle, Peter, was designated by Christ Himself as superior to the rest in spiritual discernment. This personal superiority was vested in perpetuity in his successors. In conformity to this divine design, it is said that Peter, accompanied by Paul, went to Rome and founded a Church over which he presided for twenty-five years. Thus through the assumption of Apostolic Succession and of divine foundation, the Roman hierarchy today claims ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

A similar claim of exclusive authority and of divine origin is made also by the Greek Church; and this rivalry between the two branches of the primitive Church serves to invalidate the claims of both branches with the same logic that sectarianism invalidates Protestantism in the eyes of the Roman and Greek wings of the Christian Church. The claim of both branches to Apostolic succession has been repudiated by many as absurd. It is maintained by some historians that research points to the conclusion that the two apostles visited Rome and worked independently of each other — Peter bestowing his atten-

tion upon the Jewish communities, and Paul upon the Gentiles. There are others who claim that there is no conclusive evidence that Peter was ever in Rome at all as the head of a church.

It is, however, the ground for making the claim to Apostolic succession and the circumstances that have led to the exercise of supreme authority by the Pope of Rome (not the righteousness of the claim itself) that is under present consideration. There is conclusive evidence that as early as the third century the bishops of Rome exercised cosmopolitan control of various churches, and at the Council of Nicea (325) the canons enacted assigned the honor of "first rank" to the See of Rome. Also after the division of the Roman Empire (395 A.D.), through a multitude of contributing causes, the superiority of the Bishop of Rome became more and more firmly established. Thus we find that the prestige of the Roman Empire made the Bishop of Rome the head of the Imperial Church from the first; by repeated claims to "the divine right to rule" the ecclesiastical hierarchy kept on gradually gaining strength until finally papal supremacy became an accomplished fact. It has been said, "A new Rome arose out of the ashes of the old, far mightier than the vanquished empire; for it claimed dominion over the hearts and minds of men." Thus arose a true Papal Empire whose marvelous supremacy is more far-reaching than that of any temporal power in history — an empire whose claim of supremacy went unchallenged by the Church itself for more than thirteen centuries.

The Papal Empire, however, was established and maintained only by heroic efforts on the part of the Roman

hierarchy. For scarcely had the Imperial Church been firmly established by the strong arm of the State, when the Empire itself failed her; corporate Christianity found herself standing defenseless in the presence of barbarians — the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, Franks, and Germans — all of whom she strove to Romanize through the instrumentality of the Roman Church. "The great object for which the bishops of the fifth and sixth centuries labored," says Guizot, "was the re-establishment of the Empire. She called upon barbarian kings; she conjured them to become Roman emperors; to assume the privileges of Roman emperors; to enter into the relationship with the Church that had existed between her and the Roman Empire. The attempts could not succeed — it was impossible to make a Roman Empire, or mould a Roman society out of barbarians. Like the civil world, the Church herself sank into barbarism. Christianized barbarians were but barbarians partly Christianized. Barbarians were barbarians still. When barbarians became bishops and priests, bishops and priests lived the lives of barbarians. Finally, Roman civilization almost entirely disappeared, and the very language of Rome was buried in complete barbarism; but nevertheless it was barbarism partly Christianized and civilized through the heroic beneficence of the Church."

From the fifth to the thirteenth centuries, the history of ecclesiasticism comprises both the barbarian and the feudal epochs of the Church, which so overlap and finally blend in such a manner as will permit their discussion together.

In the conditions of these days we may discover the

mission of the Roman Church. Concerning those turbulent times, the essential facts are as follows: During the six centuries called the Dark Ages all Europe was in a state of chaos. All authority was set at naught, and anarchy reigned amid the attempts of warring princes to establish local governments. During the ten centuries required to transform paganism into nominal Christianity, the Church alone retained its original organization and its power over the minds of men. The rise of Feudalism — the principle or constitution of feuds or lands held by right of military service rendered — lasted from about 800 A.D. to 1300 A.D. There was need of some kind of supreme power; and the spiritual power exercised by the Roman hierarchy supplied that need. When Feudalism (a blending of Roman and German customs) became triumphant and kings were too weak and men too ignorant to oppose the encroachments of the feudal lords, the Church was the one and only power that could restrain them. The feudal barons were men of wealth, muscle, and political power; but they were not men of culture and piety. As has been seen in foregoing chapters, Monasticism was then the most potent social force. The idea of brotherly love and the value of Christian character instilled into the minds of the earlier Christians had not perished from the earth; but found lodgment in the hearts and lives of thousands of monks. In the cloister no one was considered too lowly to be worthy of human sympathy, and the convents were called "Isles of Peace in a sea of violence and wrong," for their buildings afforded places of refuge for the oppressed. Thus the kindly ministrations of monks won the allegiance of the laity to the Church.

For a thousand years, the lamp of learning and piety burned within monastic walls alone; only the clergy and the monks of that time could read or write or make use of the Latin language, which was the sole means of communication among the different nations at that time. Priests and monks were, therefore, the teachers, secretaries, and embassadors of kings and princes. Hence the Roman hierarchy by the exercise of the inherent power of mental and moral supremacy gained an inevitable ascendency over warring officials of the State. As the mitered bishops gradually took precedence of the helmeted warriors, righteous popes swayed the scepter of intellectual and moral power. Thereby the leaven of Christianity permeated the hearts and lives of succeeding generations in a measure impossible to estimate correctly. The fact that "knowledge is power" has long been conceded; and the value of moral suasion has been generally recognized. But nowhere in history has the irresistibility of the combined force of learning and piety been so convincingly demonstrated as in the efforts of the Roman Church for self-preservation through these two agencies.

Summing up the age-long story of the growth of the Papal Empire, we find that the invasion of the Roman territory by the barbarians and the subsequent rise of Feudalism made it incumbent upon the Church, whose very existence was threatened, to defend herself by her inherent mental, moral, and spiritual power; because after the fall of the Roman Empire, she had no protector and no other means of self-preservation. In the time of her utter helplessness, she asserted her divine origin and created the conviction among the masses that "The spiritual

order, being of divine appointment, is completely separated from politics; and that the State being the inferior, has no right to interfere with the Church, the superior." Guizot has stated the fact as follows: "Spiritual power, finding herself in possession of all the intelligence of the age and at the head of all activities, was naturally led to arrogate to herself the general government of the world."

Notwithstanding all that has been said against Popery and the evils of priestcraft, the Papal Empire at its best represented the inherent spiritual power that characterizes Christianity. Concerning the age of popery Macaulay has said: "Some things which at a later period were regarded as the chief blemishes of the Church, in the seventh century and long after, were among her chief merits. That the sacerdotal order should encroach on the functions of the civil magistrates, would, in our time, be a great evil. But that which in an age of good government is an evil, may, in an age of grossly bad government, be a blessing. It is better that mankind be governed by wise laws well administered, and by enlightened public sentiment, than by priestcraft; but it is better that men should be governed by priestcraft than by force and violence. A society sunk in ignorance and ruled by merely physical force, has great reason to rejoice when a class of which the influence is intellectual and moral rises to ascendency."

Had none but wise and righteous popes exercised spiritual power only, the very beneficence of papal rule might have furnished conclusive proof of the divine appointment of all popes; but such was not the case. Finally, the Church of Rome laid claim to both temporal and spiritual

power, and unwise and unrighteous popes gained ascendency.

The political power of the Roman hierarchy rests upon a foundation differing entirely in scope, function, and source from that of her spiritual supremacy. The temporal power of the Church of Rome rested merely upon a gift of land made by Pepin the Short to Pope Stephen III. By force of arms, Pepin the Short gained possession of land in Lombardy, Ravenna, and Pentapolis. This land he handed over to Pope Stephen; and with the gift of the land, Pepin offered the suggestion, "He who has the authority of kings ought to have also the name of king." Before the end of the eighth century, the pope became the ruler over what was subsequently known as "the States of the Church."

At the beginning of the ninth century, we find that the supremacy of the pope was firmly established upon a basis of secular power and political authority. On Christmas day of the year 800, while Charlemagne was bending in prayer before the altar of Saint Peter, Pope Leo III unexpectedly placed upon the head of the Emperor "the Crown of the Caesars." Thus in theory, the Western Empire was restored under the name, "the Holy Roman Empire." By this act of Pope Leo III a *condominium* was created; that is, the imperial and papal authority was to be complementary the one to the other. Charlemagne was to claim from all other temporal rulers an allegiance corresponding to that which the Roman pontiff claimed from all other ecclesiastical potentates. The Emperor claimed the right to confirm papal elections; and the Pope claimed the right to confer temporal power upon the Emperor. This put

the Church and the State upon a basis of political equality and mutual helpfulness.

During the reign of Charlemagne, the power of the Roman bishop rested upon the grace of the Emperor. Had succeeding Carlovingian princes been endowed with the spirit of Charlemagne, the Bishop of Rome might have fallen back into the rank of the Bishop of the Metropolis. But the weakness and unworthiness of the princes of that time presented the opportunity for the popes to make bold pretenses to divine authority to rule both Church and State. This same weakness and unworthiness apparently created the necessity for priestly intervention.

At this juncture, Pope Gregory VI appeared as arbiter between the weak Louis I of France and his equally weak subjects. Pope John VIII sold the imperial crown to Charles the Bald, and Pope Nicolas I, by his writings, endeavored to give a legal foundation to the claim of temporal power. "For two hundred years," says John Lord, "the Popes themselves had been a scandal and a reproach to their exalted position. During this period, no commanding figure had worn the tiara. Two popes had been murdered; five had been driven into exile and four were deposed. Pope John X commanded an army in person; John XI was murdered by one of the infamous women whom he patronized; Benedict IX was driven from the throne for robbery and murder; while Gregory VI is known to have purchased the papal dignity."

Just when affairs of Church had sunk to the lowest depths of worldliness and immorality, things took a turn for the better. As soon as the imperial crown passed into the hands of the Germans, although the Pope crowned the

Emperor, and his dignity seemed to rest upon the investiture of the Pope, yet words and perfunctory ceremonies could not prevail against the armed forces of the Germans. This fact became apparent when at the Council of Sutri (1046) Henry III deposed three popes, caused Clement II to be appointed in their stead, and boldly claimed the right to sanction the papal election.

This supremacy of temporal power was of short duration. In the year 1059 Pope Nicolas II introduced a reform, stipulating that the election of the Pope was to be confined exclusively to the College of Cardinals — that is, that imperial sanction was neither required nor permitted. This reform, in its practical bearing prohibited investiture of the entire spiritual order by civil authorities, and restored the former independence of the Church. This successful resistance to State control was an important step toward the final supremacy of the Imperial Church. The change, however, involved the reversal of a custom of long standing; because from the time of the Council of Nicea (325) until the fall of the Western Empire (476) the Roman Church, established as the State religion, was under the protection and guidance of the Emperor and his Court. The fact was easily established that from the earliest time bishops had been accustomed to receive "the ring and crosier"— the symbols of their spiritual power — from the hands of their sovereigns. This custom called "investiture" made the popes the virtual creatures of the sovereigns; hence investiture made the Church both theoretcially and practically subordinate to the State.

We have seen in the foregoing that with the dissolution of the Roman Empire many changes took place in the

barbaric Church. We find that the century-long struggle for supremacy reached its climax during the eleventh century in the contest between Henry IV of Germany and Pope Gregory VII — familiarly known as Hildebrand. At that time the Monasteries, enriched by princes and barons during the days of Feudalism and the Crusades, now owned one-half of the lands of Europe, and more than half of its silver and gold. But the monks who now numbered not less than one hundred thousand had departed from the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. They were enjoying all of the luxuries of the times. They had become corrupted by the sins of gluttony, idleness, and ignorance. Instead of spending their time in labor, study, and religious devotion, they followed the chase, and lounged about taverns and brothels. Both the clergy and the monks, as well as the feudal lords, were notoriously ignorant, superstitious, and sensual. The few thinkers and scholars of that time were the Schoolmen — such as Anselm, and Peter Lombard, and others who were unable to cope with the intellectual torpor and moral degeneracy of the age. It has been said of this period, "The clergy and the monks were a walking libel on everything that is held sacred."

The perversity of the popes themselves had caused a defection of both clergy and laity, and the bonds of obedience to the Pope were rapidly loosening. The parish priests, especially in France and Germany, were setting at naught the vow of celibacy, not only by seeking wives, but by living in open concubinage. Through the demoralization of priests and monks, Christian morals were in danger of being driven from the Roman Church and political ambitions were about to destroy the spirit of the Christ.

The historian always finds that when gross materialism, self-indulgence, and deliberate wrong-doing seem to open the flood-gates of evil forces, and when "the last remnant of the faithful" appear to be engulfed in the stream of degeneracy — at such crises some invincible soul appears upon the stage of action, stays the flood, and finally changes the whole course of events.

At this critical moment, Hildebrand was the instrument in the hands of God for saving the Roman Church from self-destruction though its own degeneracy. Hildebrand undertook to reform the priests and monks and to re-establish the spiritual supremacy of the Roman Church over the State. For the accomplishment of his purpose he had at his command the most powerful weapon that could be employed — "the popular belief in a physical Hell of fire and brimstone." The people of this credulous age, both clergy and laity, firmly believed that the salvation of the soul can be secured only by the machinery of the Church. Consequently all were filled with fear of excommunication.

In order to reform the priests, Hildebrand undertook to enforce the keeping of the vow of celibacy among them. He forbade the further sale of ecclesiastical offices, and excluded princes from priestly services. In order to raise the power of the Church above that of the State, he declared that the Pope, having Apostolic preëminence over kings, could give and withhold crowns at pleasure; and he re-affirmed that the Pope alone had the right to appoint bishops and to invest them with ring and crosier.

The most vulnerable point among the clergy was the enforcement of the vow of celibacy. According to the pronouncements of Hildebrand, the priests were married

to the Church only; and anything that diverted the labors of the clergy from the Church he declared to be an outrage deserving the severest of punishments. To restore the practice of celibacy, he assembled a council and caused it to pass a canon to the effect that married priests could not perform any clerical office; that all who had wives should put them away, and that no married priest could be ordained without renewing the vow of celibacy. He forbade the laity to be present at a mass celebrated by a married priest. Excommunication was the penalty of disobedience to his commands. "Excommunications," says John Lord, "were hurled like thunderbolts into the remotest hamlets, and the murmurs of indignant Christians were silenced by the awful denunciations of God's viceregents on earth." Before such a terrible blow the clergy succumbed at once. Fear of an endless Hell, the fear by which the priests themselves controlled their flocks, proved to be more potent than any offer of temporal power or earthly reward has ever been; for what profiteth it, if a man gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Consequently few dared resist the spiritual monarch when disobedience would entail burning in a lake of fire forever and forever. Thus Hildebrand reëstablished celibacy as a law of the Church, and thereby purified the morals of the clergy.

The maintenance of the supremacy of the Church over the State was not so easily accomplished; but in his contest with Henry IV of Germany in the war of investiture, in a like manner Hildebrand used the fear of excommunication in dealing with his majesty. The story of the contest, briefly narrated, is as follows: Henry IV was unwilling to resign the right of investiture because the act would

release bishops and abbots from the payment of feudal tribute to himself. Therefore he assembled a Council at Worms which deposed Hildebrand from the papal throne. But the sentence of deposition was an empty one; for in reply, Hildebrand immediately excommunicated Henry IV and released his subjects from allegiance to their monarch.

The scene of the excommunication is pictured by John Lord in the following words: "It was the year 1076. Hildebrand was seated beneath the sculptured roof of the Vatican, arrayed in the rich and mystical vestments of pontifical dominion, and the papal choir was chanting those immortal anthems which have come down from saints and martyrs. In the presence of the dignitaries of the Church, Hildebrand pronounced an old-fashioned excommunication: 'Saint Peter, lend us your ears, and listen to your servant whom you have cherished from his infancy; and all saints bear witness how the Roman Catholic Church raised me by force and against my will to this high dignity, although I would have preferred to spend my days in a continual pilgrimage than to ascend to thy pulpit for any human motive. And in as much as I think it will be grateful to thee that those entrusted to my care should obey me; therefore support by these hopes, and for the honor and defence of the Church, and in the name of the Omnipotent God — Father, Son, and Holy Spirit — by my authority and by my power, I prohibit King Henry IV of Germany, who with unheard-of pride, has raised himself against the Church, from governing the kingdoms of Germany and Italy; I absolve all Christians from the oath they have taken to him, and forbid all men to yield to him that service which is due to a king. Finally I bind him with

the bonds of anathema, that all people may know that thou art Peter, and that upon thee the Son of God hath built His Church, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail'."

In describing the effect of this interdict, John Lord continues his description of the scene of excommunication: "Henry was regarded as guilty and damned; his ministers looked upon him as a Sampson shorn of his locks; his wife feared contamination from his society; his children held him as a man blasted with the malediction of Heaven. His victorious army deserted him; rival princes laid claim to his throne; his enemies multiplied; his difficulties thickened; new dangers surrounded him on every side. If loyalty to the king had summoned three hundred thousand warriors to his camp, a principle much more powerful than loyalty — the fear of Hell — had dispersed them. The diadem was obscured by the tiara, and loyalty yielded to the superior potency of religious fear."

John Lord continues the story as follows: "But excommunication was not the only penalty that Hildebrand would inflict. He declared that if the sun went down on the 23 of February, 1077, before Henry was restored to the bosom of the Church, his crown would be transferred to another. Henry was morally certain that he would lose his crown and be in danger of losing his own soul, unless he made his peace with his dangerous enemy. It was necessary that the awful curse be removed. He had no remedy; only one course was open to him. He must yield; not to man alone, but to an idea that had the force of fate. Wonder not that he made up his mind to yield. Behold the melancholy spectacle of this mighty monarch in the

depth of winter, crossing the Alps, enduring the privation, fatigue, and perils of a journey on foot to the fortress of Canossa (beyond the Po river) in which Hildebrand had entrenched himself. Even then, the angry pontiff refused to see him. Henry had to stoop to a still deeper humiliation — to stand bare-headed and bare-footed for three days amid the blasts of winter, in the court-yard of the castle, before Hildebrand would promise absolution, and then only at the intercession of the Countess Matilda.''

By this surrender of Henry IV to Hildebrand, in theory and in fact, the State conceded the supremacy of the Church, and temporal power again yielded to spiritual authority. The surrender of Henry IV was a moral victory accomplished by the indomitable Hildebrand by use of the fear of excommunication — the prevailing fear that held irresistible dominion over the minds of men of that age.

(Though irrelevant to the subject in hand, it is interesting to know that Henry IV afterwards repented his surrender and resented his humiliation by pursuing Hildebrand with a hostile army from city to city, and from convent to convent. Hildebrand died in exile — uttering the bitter words, ''I loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile.'') As other heroes, Hildebrand sacrificed himself for what he thought was a righteous cause, a principle more precious than life itself. By reforming the priests themselves Hildebrand introduced into the Roman Church a type of morality higher than that which had previously existed, and deepened the conviction that ''Righteous laws can not be violated with impunity.''

In whatever light we may view the man Hildebrand, we are compelled to admit that at a critical moment he saved the Roman Church from complete secularization and ignominious extinction. The Church that he saved is the heritage alike of Roman Catholicism and the two hundred or more Protestant communions that have sprung into being as her legitimate offspring.

The reformer, Hildebrand, passed away, but his ideas lived after him. Others reaped what he had sown. Papal power kept on gaining strength and was at its height from the time of Pope Innocent III (1194) to the time of Boniface VIII (1294). Then the power of the Papal Empire began to decline. After the principle of the supremacy of the Church was rejected by the State, the idea kept on gaining strength in the Roman Church itself for several centuries, and not until 1870 was the idea officially surrendered by the Pope.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE

The relationship between the Roman Church and the people assumes two aspects — the attitude of the hierarchy toward the common people, and also the attitude of the people toward the hierarchy — that is, the devotion of the laity to sacerdotalism and loyalty (or disloyalty) to the Pope as the head of the hierarchy.

The foregoing chapter concerns itself chiefly with contests between officials of Church and State for the possession of authority over the people; but in order rightly to estimate the value of the Roman Church, it is necessary to consider the effect of her sacerdotalism upon the populace for whose benefit the organization existed.

Resuming the story of the triumphs of Hildebrand, we remember that in the eleventh century the Imperial Church was theoretically established upon a firm foundation; and the union of temporal and spiritual power in the person of the Pope was expected to result in a theocratic form of government for both Church and State. Hildebrand had attempted to make the sovereigns of all Europe subservient to himself, and likewise to subject the laity to the clergy. "He never temporized," said Guizot, "he considered no particular interest, but openly proclaimed his determination to reign over all intellects, as well as over all kings; and thus he raised up against himself, not only temporal

power, but also all individuals who advocated the right of free inquiry — a party which began now to show itself, and to dread and exclaim against tyranny over the human mind."

The very autocratic strength of Hildebrand was also his weakness. In the end the unlimited and unyielding absolutism exercised by his successors weakened the cause which he wished to serve. Nor is such a result surprising; for it is the history of all institutions that at the very moment when they have reached the highest point in display of splendor and power, an almost insensible reaction sets in and decline begins.

Returning to the earlier history of the Roman Church, we find that before the end of the fourth century Christianity was no longer the mere expression of a personal faith in Christ as the Savior of the race, for it had become a corporate institution that possessed not only creedal affirmations, but a well organized priesthood and a definite ecclesiastical polity designed for regulating human affairs by means of provincial, national, and general or ecumenical councils. The Roman Church having become the only connecting link between civilization and barbarism was charged with the function of preserving Christianity and developing a new civilization to be built upon the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

However, by continuous further development, the clergy and the laity differentiated into two distinct bodies possessing the characteristics of castes — the clergy becoming a learned and thinking class, while the laity was denied education and was glad to accept ready-made opinions from the mouths of priests. In a foregoing chapter, we

have noted also a further cleavage in society. We have witnessed the rise of the feudal nobility, commanding homage and exercising authority over the commons. These three distinct castes — the clergy, the nobles, and the commons — had some contact, but no real union of thought and interests existed among them.

From the twelfth to the sixteenth century, attempts at government were of two kinds — an effort to unite the three castes into one body, each caste retaining its immobility (as is illustrated by the castes of India today); and also an effort to secure the government by one class of the other two classes.

The success of priestly domination has been briefly outlined in the triumph of the Imperial Church. This triumph (it has been seen) was the result of many efforts to unify society by bringing all of the people under subjection to the Roman Church — that is, to secure the submission of all classes to the principles of ecclesiastical rules. As before stated, the supremacy of Romanism, from the fifth to the tenth century, resulted from the moral and intellectual superiority of the priesthood. In estimating the value of the Roman Church in those barbaric feudal days, it is only fair to concede that had the Church made no attempt to gain supremacy, civilization might have become solidified and the three castes have been perpetuated. Under such a social stratification, the evolution of democracy in both Church and State would have become impossible.

Looking backward and examining the past in the light of democratic principles, all fair-minded persons are willing to admit (regardless of Church connections of today),

that for centuries the Roman Hierarchy made two grave mistakes in its policy toward the laity. The first mistake was the natural consequence of the doctrine that the Roman priesthood alone possessed the divine right to be the medium for the transmission of Christianity to the people — in other words, the mistake of attempting to suppress the use of individual reason among the laity. This policy of the clergy was self-condemned by its inevitable failure, since exercise of reason can not be suppressed by external force. History shows that having undertaken the impossible, every effort of the churchmen to suppress normal evolution resulted, at a later period, in revolution. "This bad principle of suppressing individual reason," says Guizot, "crept into the Church; but the complete and practical operation of the principle never took place — it was impossible that it ever should. A conviction can not enter the mind unless the mind first opens the door to it; and if belief forces an entrance, it is because reason is satisfied."

The second mistake of the Church, the effort to enforce belief by the infliction of physical torment, is the logical consequence of the first error. The principle of the duty of compulsion in belief assumed by Romanism is contrary to the nature of Christian fellowship, and was opposed by some of the most illustrious Fathers of the Roman Church — Saint Ambros, Saint Hillard, Saint Martin, and others. Contempt on the part of parish priests for the opinions of the laity (whose conduct was in their keeping) and a like scorn for the convictions of learned and pious theologians have cost the Roman Church very dear.

In tracing the effect of these two mistaken notions con-

cerning the mission of the Church, we find that they are the causes of the persecutions of Christians by Christians, of excommunications, of anathematizing of heretics, and of heresy trials among Protestants.

"Papal tyranny was counteracted," says Guizot, "by a restlessness within the Church itself which could not be overcome. We have seen heresy proscribed; the right of free inquiry condemned; a contempt shown for individual reason; the principles of the imperative transmission of doctrine by human authority established in the very bosom of the Church. Yet where can we find a society where individual reason more boldly developed itself than in the Church? What are sects and heresies but the fruits of individual opinions? These sects, these heresies, all these oppositions which arose in the Roman Church, are the most decisive proof of the life which reigned within her — a life, stormy, and painful, sown with perils, errors, and crimes — yet splendid and mighty, and one which has given place to the noblest development of the human mind."

Considered as an institution, it must be conceded that the Roman Catholic Church, both past and present, presents the most ideal and effective form of autocratic government that can be devised. From the first, it was a corporate entity, distinct, independent, and supreme in its own sphere. Today it is international in its authority, and as a means of securing obedience to a centralized power it is a perfect organization.

Notwithstanding its perfect organization and its high ambitions and determined efforts, the Imperial Church of Rome has failed to produce the theocratic State in any of

its domains; and in defiance of its autocratic spirit, democracy in both Church and State has sprung up and made remarkable progress in many lands. And why has the Imperial Church failed to produce the theocratic State? The following answer to the question is written on the pages of history: "Organization and the assumption of authority over the minds of others, is not the equivalent of executive power. An organization may formulate creeds and dogmas, but can not insure their comprehension by an ignorant and illiterate laity; neither can the clergy enforce the acceptance of any teachings among cultured and thinking persons by the mere assertion of divine rights and the infallibility of a pope."

Admirably suited as the Roman Church was to calm the turbulent spirit of an earlier age by the enforcement of an outward morality, by the development of a spirit of obedience to authority and by reverence for sacred symbols of religion, it can no longer do so. It is unsuited to the needs of the masses in a democratic age. The impossibility of establishing the theocratic Church or State by outward authority arises, as has been previously stated, from the very nature of the mind itself and its grasp of spiritual realities. It is true that Mohammed destroyed Arabic idolatry by use of fire and sword, but the ultimate success of the Saracenic civilization was due to its peaceful pursuits of the arts and sciences, and the practice of the Christian virtues (common to both religions) and to faith in a supreme Intelligence that rewards the good deeds of men beyond the grave. In short, the Imperial Church failed because the spirit of Christianity is the exact antithesis of Imperialism: force and violence in the

name of Christianity, as in the name of Mohammedanism, is doomed to failure and extinction by the invincible power of love, divine and human. Christianity is the religion of peace on earth and good-will among men regardless of race, language, or religious creeds. Any and every deviation from the law of love is a perversion of the faith and practices enjoined by the Christ. At its birth Christianity was not armed with temporal power; in its earlier years, as today, it made converts by the force of its ideas only and captured the hearts and minds of men by love alone.

It is to the credit of the Roman Church that most of the opposition to the abuse of authority and protests against moral degeneracy were begun by churchmen themselves.

In order to understand the beginning of the democratic Church by the throwing off of the yoke of Roman Imperialism, it is necessary to understand something of the rise of free cities in Italy and Germany. These free cities, modeled after the ideas of ancient Greece, mark the beginning of social democracy which found later expression in the Church. All Europe had inherited from the past clear conceptions of the various forms of social union known as monarchy, aristocracy, theocracy, and democracy. The common people finally began to make choice of the principles of democracy and to assert the right of self-government and to put them into practice in free cities — that is, cities attempted to employ pure democracy in municipal affairs. To follow the evolution of the democratic State from its beginning, would take us far afield; hence the present survey must be limited to the evolution of democracy in the Church only.

The historian finds that each age is foreshadowed in the previous one; that the characteristics of each age commence in the preceding one; and that successive ages graduate more or less and overlap each other. For the present then, we may leave the Imperial Church to follow the fortunes of those heretics whose emancipated minds foreshadowed the democratic age. For our purposes, we can not do better than consider the achievements of some of the democratic churchmen before the revolt of Martin Luther.

Let us consider the services rendered to the cause of democracy by John Wyclif (1324-1384) who was a teacher in the University of Oxford, England. Some of his heresies have been mentioned in an earlier chapter. Although himself a member of the clerical order, he declared that no cleric should be allowed to hold a secular office; he denounced the usurpations of the popes in demanding the payment of "Peter's Pence" and other unlawful exactions; in the contest between Popes Clement and John, he openly declared that "The Church would be better off with no pope at all." He also disapproved the withholding the cup from the laity in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and he bewailed the presence of twenty thousand monks who were living idle and dissolute lives as mere parasites upon a population of less than four millions of souls on English soil. He sought to destroy the pernicious influences of the Mendicants who became vendors of pardons for grievous sins — the inference of the transaction being that "venal absolution and penance can take the place of a clean heart and a pure life." Wyclif was not a radical reformer. It was the corruption

of the institutions of the Roman Church, her abuses of power, her false doctrines and the inferences made from her practices, that he attacked — not the autocracy of the Church. He defied the Pope only in so far as he sought to usurp the power of secular rulers in his own land. Wyclif's greatest service to the common people was the translation of the Vulgate Bible into English. This act was condemned by the churchmen. The offence was declared to be "sacrilege punishable by fine, imprisonment, and excommunication; because the reading of the Scriptures implied the right of private judgment on the part of the reader."

The many misdeeds of the hierarchy itself had lowered the estimate of the churchmen in the popular mind, and the criticisms and opinions of Wyclif found favor among the common people. Thus John Wyclif, a thin, worn, and meditative professor in a Catholic university, put the Bible into the hands of the people of England with no compunction of conscience. By unsealing the sacred Book for English readers, this democratic Catholic barely escaped imprisonment and fines during his life; after his death he was excommunicated and anathematized most severely. By the translation of the Scriptures, however, he prepared the way for the growth on English soil of the conviction that "All men possess, as a gift from God, the right of private judgment concerning the meaning of the Bible."

The Wyclifites, called Lollards, kept alive and handed down to the next generation the idea, "The Scriptures furnish the only rule of faith and practice for the Christian." Wyclif's idea of the value and use of the Scrip-

tures took immediate and permanent possession of the minds of a large number of people in the Church before the time of Martin Luther. During his life, this Oxford reformer was the companion chiefly of men of rank and learning; but his ideas were both spiritual and democratic and found lodgment in the minds of thousands of yoemen and artizans. Not until the year 1416 were the Lollards hunted down as heretics; but thereafter they were made victims of bitter persecutions, and the severest inquisitions made every parish of England the scene of cruelty. The Lollards, nevertheless, proved themselves witness to "the presence of the Holy Spirit" by making themselves a willing sacrifice to the cause of Christ — witnesses faithful unto death.

Another representative reformer within the Roman Church was the Dominican monk, Savonarola (1452-1497), Prior of Saint Mark's Cathedral, Florence, Italy. It was the mission of this great preacher to be a maker of public sentiment during the reign of Pope Alexander VI, of the infamous family of the Borgias. Savonarola protested against the many sins of his age — personal vices among men in high places, nepotism, simony, efforts of the clergy to obtain temporal dominion, the idolatrous worship of the images by the ignorant, and the apathy and indifference of the rich and idle toward all that is ennobling.

Savonarola's age was also that of the Medici, who figured in attempts to suppress the spirit of democracy. In this contest the intrepid Prior of Saint Mark's took sides with the common people. He fearlessly proclaimed the doctrine, "The people are the only source of political power." Out of the ninety thousand inhabitants of Flor-

ence, Savonarola called an assemblage of three thousand of the ablest citizens to act as representatives, urging them to take the reigns of government from the hands of the tyrannical Medici.

Pope Alexander VI tried to bribe Savonarola to silence by the offer of a cardinal's hat; but the reformer scorned the hypocritical offer of friendship. The haughty Pope then answered the call to righteousness in the Church by hurling the thunderbolt of excommunication against his accusers, and commanded the magistrates of Florence to forbid Savonarola to preach in the city. Reluctantly but of necessity they obeyed their Pope. Hence the most renowned orator of all Italy and of his age entered his pulpit and took an affectionate leave of his congregation; and his eloquent voice was heard no more in the Cathedral of Saint Mark.

After Savonarola had been excommunicated and silenced, he addressed letters to the kings of France and Germany and Spain and England, asking them to call a council and depose the simonical pope. The letters were intercepted by emissaries of the Pope, and Savonarola was unable to secure recourse to any kind of a tribunal of justice. Finally, the fickle populace of Florence deserted the reformer and demanded that he be tried by the ordeal of fire. He consented to the cruelty, if only he might be allowed to carry the crucifix or the sacrament in his hand. His superstitious enemies feared to yield to his request to expose the symbols of his faith to the crucial test of fire, and they cast him into an inquisitorial prison and subjected him to physical torture. In a single day he was drawn up by a rope fourteen times and suddenly dropped.

With muscles quivering with pain, they plied him with questions. He replied, "If I have written or preached anything heretical, I am willing to make a public recantation. I have always shown obedience to the Church; but it is my duty to obey God rather than man." No recantation was required; his doctrines were orthodox; his obedience to papal authority was unquestioned. It was his crime and his undoing that he had befriended the people against the tyranny of popes and princes; that he had preached truth and righteousness in a degenerate age; that he had called to repentance sinners in high places. The inquisition lasted one month. He had laid no claim to being a prophet, and they could find no fault in him; yet the inquisitors were determined to put him to death. Disrobed of his ecclesiastical garb, he mounted the scaffold and submitted his neck to the hangman. Thus Savonarola, who was filled with piety and zeal for the regeneration of his age, was misunderstood, his virtues were condemned and punished as fanaticism, obstinacy, and disobedience. He died a martyr to holy living within the Imperial Church; but his protests, his preaching, and his martyrdom were not in vain. By the premature sacrifice of his life, he inaugurated the political reforms that took place fifty years after his execution. It was the dawning of the day of democracy in Church and State.

PART SECOND

The Second Period of Creedal Christianity—The Democratic Christian Church and the Clarified and Enriched Creed.

"It is never easy and it is sometimes hazardous to attempt an analysis of the religious conditions of the times of which one is a part. There is always danger, in making such an analysis, of mistaking an eddy for a full current, and also of being mistaken both as to the nature and direction of the tributary streams. It is the habit of most of us to allow our local conditions to color our view of the whole field. What Lord Salisbury said to the critics of his world-compelling diplomacy, 'Study large maps,' is good advice for all of us to take when we consider the movements at work for the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ. We must study the spiritual movement, not in its local and transient aspects, but in its world-wide and age-long sweep."— Rev. John F. Carson, D.D.

CHAPTER I

MARTIN LUTHER, THE LEADER OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

The term, reformation, has always suggested the existence of something that demands changes in human organizations. Usually such changes are due to growth and progress in civilization. To the law of change, Christian institutions have been no exception. From the beginning of the Roman Church, ecclesiastical changes of various kinds were undertaken, and from time to time an uplift of moral standards had been required. Before the revolt of Martin Luther, reforms had been attempted by John Huss and Jerome of Bohemia, Erasmus of Holland, Ulrich von Hutten, and others. In the foregoing chapter mention was made of the unsuccessful efforts of Wyclif and Savonarola to elevate the morals of the Roman Hierarchy. It must be understood that these illustrious men prepared the way for Martin Luther; because it is the teaching of history that only through the persistent efforts of like-minded individuals through succeeding generations can the lost cause of one generation culminate, in a later one, in the success of some out-standing, epoch-making event.

Historians of the past have usually regarded the Protestant Reformation as beginning in the year 1520 A.D., when Luther publicly burned the Bull of Excommunica-

tion issued by Pope Leo X; and it is usually stated that the period ended with the Treaty of Westphalia in the year 1648, when the warring Catholic and Protestant States agreed to live in peace and amnesty, regardless of religious opinions.

Different causes for the rise of Protestantism have been assigned by different classes of writers — the causes assigned differing with the color of the spectacles through which the events have been viewed. Enemies of the Reformation are still imputing the motives of Luther to his jealousy of the Dominican friars to whom had been entrusted the sale of Indulgences. Others have judged the movement to be an expression of rivalry between ecclesiastical factions, the ambitions of sovereigns, and the desire of the nobility to get possession of the property of the Church. One writer has even assumed that the desire of Martin Luther to marry Catherine von Bora could have produced an effect of such mammoth proportions. Doubtless the hunger for personal righteousness, the hope of the redress of personal grievances, and the desire of the spiritually-minded to return to the simplicity of the Apostolic Age, furnished many individuals with motives strong enough to impel them to participation in revolt against both the faith and the practice of the Roman Church.

Concerning the condition of the age of the Reformation, it is often falsely asserted that the revolt took place at a time when the usurpations of the Church had become so enormous as to be utterly intolerable to the laity. Such, however, was not the case. Instead of being a period of the decline of churchmen, it was instead a period of the

highest development of the laity, who had become dissatisfied with the perfunctory services of the Roman priests. "It is not true," says Guizot, "that in the sixteenth century the Court of Rome was very tyrannical; it is not true that their abuses were more numerous and crying than they had been at former times. The Reformation was a sudden effort of the human mind to achieve its liberty. It was an insurrection of human intelligence. This was the leading cause which soared above all the rest; a cause superior to every interest of either sovereigns or nations, to every need of reform or redress of grievances which were complained of at that period."

It is also a mistake to assert that Luther created the Reformation which in the sixteenth century had become more than a war upon the corruptions of the times, such as Wyclif and Savonarola had instigated. The fact is that the laity had reached a point where they felt themselves able to think for themselves and they no longer submitted to the tyranny of the ecclesiastics. The common people knew that they had a right to revolt against dogmatic, ritualistic, and autocratic sacerdotalism. Luther gave utterance to the unexpressed convictions of thousands of awakened minds; and his liberating words broke the yoke of fear that held them in subjection to the century-long priestcraft of Romanism.

With the perspective of increasing years, wherein the enchainment of events may be seen as causes and effects, the Reformation is beginning to be looked at in a new light. It is now seen to be a many-sided movement of amazing magnitude, affecting not only the religious and moral life of the sixteenth century, but also the intellectual,

political, economic, and industrial life of all succeeding ages.

In order to state more nearly correctly either the beginning or the end of the period, we must carefully consider several factors — not only the conditions and opinions of the people of that time, but the preparation of Martin Luther for leadership of the movement; his timely messages and their manifold implications; the fruitage of these spiritual messages; and the probable outcome of liberty of conscience in religion that may be expected in the future.

Preparation of Luther for the leadership of the revolt is known to all students of history. He was born at Eisleben, Saxony. His parents were peasants, and his childhood was one of grinding poverty. But notwithstanding the poverty of the family, Luther's father desired that his son, Martin, should become a lawyer. Through great sacrifices on the part of his parents, at the age of eighteen years Martin was enabled to enter the University of Erfurt. After four years of faithful study he took his degree with unusual distinction. But when he was just ready to begin the study of law, to the surprise of all he gave up the promise of a successful career as a lawyer and entered a monastery of the Augustinian friars. Why he did as he did, history does not state. We are left free to infer that his course of conduct was the result of some inward compulsion impossible to explain.

While in the monastery, Luther was tormented with an agonizing sense of being a depraved sinner deserving the wrath of God. He strove to attain a sense of inward peace through strict observance of all of the rules of penance,

mortification of the flesh, vigils, fastings, and the like. But the much desired peace of mind did not come. He then turned to a study of the Bible and the writings of Saint Augustine and the mystics of the early Church. Finally, he came to the conclusion that nothing but a personal faith in the atoning power of the Christ can give an assurance of the soul's salvation. By his labors as a teacher and a preacher he now desired to impart to others the peace of mind that came to him through faith alone, without further austerities. In accordance with his desire, in the year 1508 he became a professor in the University of Wittenberg. There he began to teach the old Pauline doctrine of salvation — a doctrine new alike to himself and his age. As yet he had no thought of attacking the Church; but he had an abiding conviction concerning the way of salvation derived from his own experiences and confirmed by reading the Scriptures.

The time and place of his complete conversion — that is, his turning away from sacerdotalism as a means of salvation — is given in his own writings. It is his testimony that when on a penitential pilgrimage to Rome, while kneeling on the stairway of the Vatican, there came to him with increasing and insistent emphasis the spiritual message, "Salvation is the gift of God, and justification is by faith alone." He was now not as other monks; austerities could do nothing more for him. As he stood face to face with spiritual realities, he saw the path of future progress for the race, and was a free man. Henceforth he was unafraid. In the strength of his conviction that "The just shall live by faith alone," he was now ready, if need be, to challenge the whole world to refute, if possible, his

interpretation of the Scriptures. At that hour he became a true illuminate, conditioned and commissioned for beginning the great work of freeing Christianity from its accretions of pagan superstitions and the weight of Roman ecclesiasticism.

The leading facts concerning Luther's revolt are well known to both Catholics and Protestants, and may be briefly recapitulated as follows: Pope Leo X felt the need of money to complete Saint Peter's Cathedral in Rome. In order to secure money from the laity, he resorted to the sale of indulgences — an indulgence being defined by the Roman Church as "the relaxation of temporal punishment which still remains due to sin, after its guilt has been remitted by the sacrament of penance." In Germany, the Dominican monk, Tetzel, was made vendor of the remission of penalties, and his offensive abuse of the idea of penance shocked the religious sensibilities of the age.

Martin Luther then appeared upon the stage. In the warmth of debate he passed from mere condemnation of the abuse of penance to an attack upon its efficacy and the false principle of morality upon which the practice is based. Consequently, on October 8, 1517, he nailed up against the Church door of Wittenberg his famous "Ninety-five Theses," which were chiefly searching questions of abstract theology concerning penance. In this manner he called out the spirit of inquiry; and he appealed to the intelligence of the laity rather than to the clergy to justify his position. Again, in a disputation with John Eck in Leipsig, Luther went far beyond a mere attack upon the practice of penance and its unrighteous implications. He re-affirmed many of the teachings of John Huss;

and it was difficult to see what fate was awaiting him other than a like fate of martyrdom for opinion's sake.

As soon as Luther's activities were discovered by Pope Leo X he demanded that the reformer recant and burn his writings. Luther refused to recant and burn his writings. Upon his refusal to obey the command, he publicly burned the Bull of Excommunication with the entire code of decrees. By this act of defiance he broke with the Roman Church and staged the drama of the Protestant Reformation for the enactment of some of the most tragic scenes of all history. Following the act of burning the Bull of Excommunication, the Imperial Diet of Worms convened in April, 1521, to consider the penalty for his defiance of papal authority. At that time and place also Luther was again commanded to recant and burn his writings. Again he refused to do so. Then and there he gave the final answer, "I trust neither Pope nor Council; I am bound by the Scriptures by me cited; I can not and I will not recant." Then breaking away from his formal Latin he said in his mother tongue, "Hier stehe ich; ich kann nicht anders; Gott helfe mir, Amen."

In the following May an edict was issued ordering Luther to be delivered to Emperor Charles V of Germany for execution. His writings were to be burned and all of his property was to be confiscated. But by a series of favoring circumstances (irrelevant to the subject under discussion) he escaped execution and lived for a time in disguise in the Castle of Wartburg. There he occupied himself by completing his translation of the Bible into German; for he fully believed that if the Bible were read by all men in all stations of life, the same assurance of

salvation by faith in Christ that had come to him, would come likewise to all other men.

In spite of the dangers that threatened him, he finally left the Castle of Wartburg and returned to Wittenberg. While there he translated the Latin Mass into German, wrote some memorable hymns, and changed the organization of the local church in some noteworthy respects. His work was both destructive and constructive. He tore down that he might find room to build better. He renounced papal authority; he rejected all offers of pardon for his sins; he denounced as heresy the pagan idea of the Syriac monk that "Repentance must be expressed by some act of penance." He rejected the Latin Mass, and prayers for the dead, the invocation of saints, and the celibacy of the clergy. He himself embarked upon the sea of matrimony by marriage with Catherine von Bora.

Thus we find that the Protestant Reformation began with the Scriptural message, "Salvation is by the grace of God, and justification is by faith alone." But it was the implication of this message that struck the death-blow to Roman sacerdotalism — the implication that no priestly intervention is necessary, and no form of sacerdotalism is indispensable to salvation. The most far-reaching innovation, however, was the setting up of the principle of "the right of private judgment in the interpretation of the sacred Scriptures," which was to take the place of papal authority and the decrees of the Councils.

Concerning the immediate effect of Protestantism, Guizot has stated the case as follows: "Protestantism introduced religion into the midst of the laity, into a world, so to speak, of believers. Till then religion had been the property

of the ecclesiastical order. The clergy distributed the proceeds of Theology, but reserved for themselves the disposal of the capital, and almost the privilege and exclusive right to speak of it. The Reformation threw matters of religion, or religious beliefs, into general circulation, opened to believers the field of faith into which they had not been allowed to enter for centuries. It had also at that time a further result; it banished, or nearly so, religion from politics and restored the independence of both temporal and spiritual powers."

As has been suggested by the foregoing, the texture of the politico-religious order, as conceived of by all classes before the Reformation was woven around the idea of "an objective, immutable, and divine revelation, intelligible to the clergy only." Church and State were thought of, not as two rival powers, but as different activities of the one *Corpus Christianum*, both activities divinely appointed, constituted, and guided. Hence the logical and inevitable result of the rupture made in the ecclesiastical polity of Luther and his followers was the destruction, in a large measure, of "faith in the divine appointment of both kings and priests."

It is generally believed that Luther did not foresee and fear the multiplicity of interpretations of the Bible by the laity that have resulted in wide-spread and hostile sectarianism; neither did he anticipate the political changes called "representative" and "democratic government." It may be said of Luther, as of many others, "He builded better than he knew."

Space forbids the review of the continued and rapid growth of democratic ideas on both continents since the

sixteenth century; but every American school boy knows the story of the Pilgrim Fathers, and their determination "to find a place where they might worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience."

Not until 1546 — or twenty-five years after the issuing of the Edict of Worms that had commanded the execution of Luther — was Emperor Charles V of Germany free from military services abroad, and ready to suppress the new beliefs at home. The result was that Luther escaped martyrdom for opinion's sake and punishment by the Church Court, other than imprisonment for a short time. Four months after Charles V of Germany began his memorable attack upon heretics, Martin Luther passed peacefully away in the sixty-fourth year of his life, at Eisleben, the place of his birth. Thus for a quarter of a century the great reformer continued his labors unmolested by heresy-hunters and heretic-destroyers.

The most marked immediate effect of the Reformation was the division of the States of Europe into Catholic and Protestant. It was this division that led to bitter persecutions and bloody wars, until the abandonment on the part of the Roman Church (1870) of all pretensions to temporal power.

In conclusion, concerning the Reformation begun in the sixteenth century we need say only that the time was ripe for the emancipated minds of that age to begin to throw off the tyrannical yoke of Roman Imperialism. The hour had struck. A prepared man and a noble cause had met. A peasant monk entered upon a course of conduct that led to the Protestant Reformation and all that has followed, and is yet to follow in the Second Constructive Period of

Creedal Christianity. Now after the lapse of but four centuries, we find democracy in both Church and State among the most enlightened people of the earth.

But the end is not yet. Today the chief distinction between Romanism and any of the two hundred or more Protestant denominations is now, as it has been in the past, largely a difference in the *interpreter* rather than in the interpretations themselves. Because, with the right of private judgment by all once conceded, a multiplicity of conflicting interpretations of the Scriptures is inevitable. Today, in consequence of "the literalism" of Biblical cosmogony, "the Premillenarianism" of the Fundamentalists, and the teachings of modern Spiritualists and other growing cults of our day, it must be admitted that the unanswerable questions still remain, "Who knows?" and "What and where is to be the final Court of Appeal in the interpretation of the Scriptures as an infallible finality?"

It has been said, "Truth needs two wings with which to fly — the conservative and the progressive." All denominations today have these two wings. Those who rely upon the Master's words, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world," are undismayed by change and are ready to face any conditions that may arise from differences of opinion concerning things that may be discerned only by the aid of the Holy Spirit — "the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

Our further historical survey will concern itself with the discovery of the progress made by like-minded Christians toward spiritual unity in democratic denominationalism begun by Martin Luther, the leader of the Protestant Reformation.

CHAPTER II

REFORM WITHIN THE IMPERIAL CHURCH

The sixteenth century marks also the beginning of a new era for Romanism. With the increase of intelligence, in which all shared, the moral tone of the clergy was elevated and the most flagrant abuses of papal authority abandoned. Reformation within the Roman Church, called the Counter Reformation, and that without, called Protestantism, are both said to have a racial basis. The Latin races of Italy, France, and Spain remained loyal to the Roman Church; the Teutonic races of the North (except the Slavs in Austria) followed the leadership of the Saxon, Martin Luther.

As Protestantism was staked on the right of private interpretation of the Scriptures as the sole authority in religion and upon justification by faith alone without the intervention of priests, so, too, reform within the Roman Church was still staked upon the necessity of priestly intervention for the salvation of the soul and the imperialistic idea of discipline; the expounding of dogma; and the perfection of ecclesiasticism as a piece of machinery.

The complete revision of Romanistic dogma of the sixteenth century, as distinct from Medieval Theology, is understood to have been the work of twenty-five sessions of the Council of Trent in the Tyrol, at intervals from 1546 to 1763. The Council of Trent has been called "the

water-shed of Romanism," because the Council began by inviting Protestants to attend and to coöperate with them. To the decrees then made have been added only the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (1854) and that of Papal Infallibility (1879).

Concerning the purpose of the invitation extended to Protestants to attend the Council of Trent, J. H. Allen has said: "Doubtless they hoped, like a political caucus, to hold those who joined in the debate bound by its decision. But the concessions were soon found to be all on one side — unless in such externals as reluctantly allowing the cup to the laity. The rigid fixing of its boundaries at that time walled out all Protestants of Europe as sharply and with as little prospect of its recovery as was the previous walling out and off of the Eastern Church by the unyielding claims of Rome. Since that time (with the exception of Modernism advocated by individuals belonging to the Church) Roman ecclesiasticism has repelled ever more and more imperiously those who strayed beyond the dogmatic boundaries then set up, and has refused all suggestions of peace. For four centuries, progress in the Imperial Church has consisted largely in drawing sharper lines between itself and Protestantism by throwing off by excommunication, persecution and inquisition, all neutral and progressive members. Although occupying a more limited field from century to century, it has constantly tightened the reigns of its authority over all those within its power. By so doing, Romanism has become intensive instead of extensive; thus it has departed from the idea of Catholic, meaning universal."

The reforms undertaken in the sixteenth century may be

enumerated thus: The enforcement of discipline among the clergy; the establishment of Jesuitical schools for the instruction of youths; the personal supervision of the clergy by the bishops; and the offering of authoritative expositions of the Creed — especially the points debated at the time of the Reformation, justification, predestination, and the sacraments.

At the time of Luther's revolt, the people in France and Italy and Spain were appalled at the rude handling by the Protestants of things which they had long held sacred and inviolable. The fermentation and agitation of the time resulted in the development of a religious movement among the laity within the Church also — a moral revival of individual convictions resulting in greater devotion to the Church. There was an awakening of both clergy and laity to the necessity for defending the truths of religion for which the Roman Church was supposed to be the instrument. This movement was called the Counter Reformation.

The nature of the Counter Reformation within the Church may be summed up as an attempt at the revival of the Pietism of the Middle Ages with an external reform of manners and morals. In order to strengthen the papal power, an effort was made to revive the influence of the monasteries. Hence the reform within the Church resulted, as earlier reforms had done, in the founding of a new monastic order, the Jesuits, or Society of Jesus. In this emergency, when the very foundations of the pontifical throne were being rudely shaken by the success of Martin Luther, the venerable Benedictines and their once illustrious branches the Cistercians and Cluniacs, and the Mendicant orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, were found

to be lacking in moral worth and were ridiculed by the laity who hated them. Hitherto Romanism had been able to depend upon the allegiance of the monks, learned and pious and loyal even to death. But not so now at this critical juncture.

Nevertheless, before the Church crumbled and fell for want of defenders, suddenly and unexpectedly arose one, Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish nobleman and soldier who, fired with zeal, began to fight for the papal cause. It was the year 1540 that this Spanish soldier dedicated himself to the Roman Church, and bound himself and six companions by irrevocable vows "to go wherever the Pope would send them, as preachers, teachers, and missionaries; and to go instantly without discussion, conditions, or rewards." In this manner a new spirit was awakened in all lands wherever the Roman Church had penetrated; and for more than a century and a half the new Jesuitical order became the most efficient ally that the Popes have ever had.

The Order of Jesuits was an institution unique in history. The object of the older Monastic societies, as has been previously stated, was the sanctification of the individual; and the community life was considered merely as a better means for the improvement of personal character. The founder of the Order of Jesuits started at once with a totally different purpose. To Loyola from the first, "society was everything and the individual nothing, except so far as he might prove to be a useful instrument for carrying out the plans of the Society of Jesus." Furthermore, the new order was a military organization, at the head of which was a general elected for life to the

position of absolute power. The chief value and purpose of the spiritual exercises were the breaking down of *the personal will* in absolute and voluntary surrender to authority. The suppression of personal ambition was secured by barring out all access to a cardinal's hat or other similar dignity.

"Ignatius Loyola established a society," says John Lord, "in the confidence and affection of the Catholics of Europe, against the voice of universities, the fears of monarchs, and the jealousies of other monastic orders. In sixteen years, this ridiculed and wandering Spanish fanatic had risen to a condition of great influence and power, second only to the Pope himself; animating the councils of the Vatican, moving the minds of kings, controlling the souls of numerous fraternities, and making his influence felt in every corner of the world. Before the remembrance of his passionate eloquence, his fiery eyes, and his countenance of seraphic piety had passed away from the minds of his own generation, his disciples had planted their missionary stations among Peruvian mines, in the marts of the African slave-traders, among the Islands of the Indian Ocean, on the coasts of Hindustan, and in the cities of Japan and China, and in the recesses of the Canadian forests, and in the wilds of the Rocky Mountains. The Jesuits had the most important chairs in the uinversities; they were the confessors of monarchs and men of rank; they had control of the schools of Italy, France, Austria, and Spain; and they had become the most eloquent, learned, and fashionable preachers in all Catholic countries. The Jesuit Order had grown to be a great institution — an organization instinct with life, a mechanism

endued with great energy and will; forming a body that could out-watch Argus with his thousand eyes, and outwork Briarius with his hundred arms; they had twenty thousand arms extending over the necks of every sovereign and all of their subjects — a mighty moral and spiritual power, irresponsible, irresistible, omnipotent, connected intimately with the education, the learning, and the religion of the age; yea, the prime agent in political affairs, the prop alike of absolute monarchies and the papal throne, whose interests they made identical with their own."

What was the secret of their success? The following brief answer has been given to the interesting inquiry: "Three things; first, the Jesuits possessed one will and one purpose only; second, at the beginning, they were characterized by great and extraordinary virtues, abilities, and zeal; third, their wonderful machinery was perfect in the adaptation of means to an end."

The Jesuits endeavored to adapt monastic ideas to the changing spirit of the times; they threw away the distinct garb of the cloister of the Middle Ages and wore the ordinary dress of gentlemen. There was nothing repulsive or ascetic about them. They were men of fine manners and cultivated speech and deportment. They did not beg, and they were neither worldly-minded nor gluttonous, not idle, nor pleasure-loving. For more than one hundred and fifty years they had none of the faults of the monks that had become obnoxious to the laity. As has been previously stated, the one great object of the Jesuits was the restoration of the Papal Church to its ancient place of power in Europe; hence the whole order feared, hated, and opposed the emancipated mind and the progressive spirit of Protestantism.

While Protestantism, failing to understand its own nature, power, and mission, was lost in controversies, men like Francis Xavier (1552) went forth to carry the Gospel Message to China and Japan; and Joseph Anchieta was carrying the message to Indians in South America, and Father Marquette and others, revered in America today, were attempting to civilize the North American Indians.

"The Jesuitic missionary," says Stephens, "with his breviary under his arm, his beads in his girdle, and his crucifix in his hand, went forth without fear to encounter the dreaded dangers. Martyrdom was nothing to him; for he knew that the altar that might stream with blood, and the mounds which might be raised over his grave would become cherished objects of his fame, and expressive emblems of the power of his religion. *Ad majoram dei gloriam* was the motto that was emblazoned on their standards when they went forth as Christian warriors to overcome the heresies of Christendom and the superstitions of idolaters."

John Lord has described them as follows: "The Jesuits were a spiritual army of the highest disciplined troops. Loyola had been a soldier; he knew what military discipline could do; how impotent an army is without it and what awful power it is with discipline, the severer the better."

It was this unconditional obedience, the general standing in the place of God, that made the organization so efficient as an instrument for accomplishing its ends. Nevertheless, in the course of time the Jesuits failed in their mission as had the older religious orders. They finally declined in enthusiasm and in heroic character. They failed because

the individuals composing the order had no personal conscience, but were bound to do unquestioningly the bidding of the leaders. When the individuals composing the order had no conscience, the order itself became a soulless corporation and an abject slave of papal power; consequently the conscienceless and collective order thought only of outward success without regard for the means used to secure it. At last they adopted the doctrine of expediency, "The end justifies the means." The Jesuits did not invent the principle; it is as old as civilization itself, and is used today by the unscrupulous in all walks of life. They believed, as do people today, that "Nothing succeeds like success." As a result of their misconceptions of truth and honor, they became defenders of evils as flagrant as was the sale of indulgences by the Dominican friars.

Says John Lord: "Jesuitism and expediency are convertible terms. The Jesuits are accused of perverting education, of abusing the confessional, of corrupting moral and political philosophy, and of conforming to the inclinations of the great. They went so far as to inculcate mental reservations — thus attacking truth in its most sacred citadel, the conscience of mankind. They made habit and bad example almost a sufficient exculpation for crime. Perjury would be allowable, if the perjured were inwardly determined not to swear. They invented the notion of probabilities, according to which a person might express any opinion he pleased, although he knew it to be wrong, provided authors of reputation had defended that opinion. A man might fight a duel, if by refusing to fight he would be called a coward. As missionaries they gave to converts the crucifix which would cover up all sin; and they per-

mitted their converts to retain their ancient habits and customs.''

''Everybody knows,'' says Guizot, ''that the principal power instituted to contend against the Reformation, was the Order of the Jesuits. Look for a moment at their history. They failed everywhere. Wherever they interfered to any extent, they brought misfortune upon the cause in which they meddled. In England they ruined kings; in Spain, the whole mass of the people. The general course of events, the developments of modern civilization, the freedom of the mind — all these forces with which the Jesuits were called upon to contend rose up against them and condemned them. And not only did they fail, but they failed on account of the means that they were constrained to employ. After a century and a half, there was nothing great and splendid in what they did; they produced no striking events; they did not put into motion any more powerful masses of men. They proceeded by dark and hidden courses, courses by no means suited to conciliate that public interest which always attaches itself to great things, whatever may be their principles and object.''

Thus we find that they tried to rivet fetters upon the emancipated minds of the age; but do what they might in any way they might choose, they could not prevent the progress of the democratic spirit of Protestantism. They tried in vain to restore the absolutism of kings and the imperialism of popes. They were unable to accomplish the impossible.

What was the result? At last they entered into political intrigues where their perfidy was discovered, and consequently the order was dissolved. The immediate instru-

ment of their humiliation was the infamous Madame De Pompadour. The Jesuits had been hostile to her ascendancy over King Louis XV of France. She hated the Jesuits as they hated her; and she urged Louis XV to make use of public opinion against them to the suppression of the order itself. The kings of Naples, Spain, and Portugal united with the king of France in demanding from Pope Clement XIV the abrogation of their charter. And by a papal decree, in the year 1772, the order was suppressed. Six hundred and sixty-nine colleges were closed; two hundred and twenty-three missions were abandoned and more than two thousand members of the order were dispersed.

Nearly a century and a half later, however, the order was restored by the Bourbons, and protected by the papal court. Purified of its moral degeneracy, the Jesuit Order today stands as a monument to Roman Imperialism in the Church, with its great army of men acting under a recognized and supreme commander — an infallible pope and all subordinate officers resolute, obedient, and united.

The story of the rise and fall and rise again contains a patent moral: Their marvelous career shows that they reaped as they had sown in different generations — now good, now evil, and again according to their sowing. It was not the success that they had earned in the first century that made them odious at a later date. It was the means used to perpetuate the power of the order after their heroic virtues had declined, that made them detested alike by Romanism and Protestantism. The story of the Jesuits is the old, old story of the self-love of selfish humanity. They loved their life, and they loved it more

than they loved truth and righteousness, and thereby they lost it.

While the order itself failed, it must not be forgotten that thousands of individuals among them gave themselves unreservedly to a cause greater than themselves. The Jesuits once had a true mission to protect and to perpetuate a form of Christianity throughout the whole world through the centuries of intellectualism, rationalism, and agnosticism in Protestant ranks. For, by the aid of the Jesuits, Romanism has held in trust as the heritage of the larger Catholicism of the coming democratic Church of Christ, "Faith in God, faith in Jesus Christ, faith in the immortality of the human soul, faith in a supersensuous world peopled with spiritual beings clothed in the radiant glory of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

CHAPTER III

THE METAPHYSICAL STAGE OF THEOLOGY

In foregoing chapters have been pictured the opening scenes of a Thought-epoch of the Second Period of Creedal Christianity, in which we are now living. We learned that in a moment of spiritual illumination, Luther saw the light and spoke for countless thousands the liberating words that broke for them the yoke of Roman Imperialism. Luther's doctrinal statement, "Salvation is by the grace of God, and justification is by faith alone," was but the beginning of efforts made by emancipated minds to express in Scriptural terms their personal religious convictions.

The pre-eminent theologian of the Reformation, whose influence has extended down to the present day, was John Calvin. This genius was born in Picardy, France, in the year 1509, and he was converted to Protestantism in his twentieth year. He passed the greater part of his life at Geneva, Switzerland, where democracy had been introduced into municipal government. At this time, the anarchial tendencies of extremists were so marked that Calvin was compelled to create an ecclesiastical code to curb them.

Although the civil polity of Geneva had been established before Calvin took up a residence in that city, he exercised great influence on its administration. Hence, in the discussion of his theology, we are compelled to consider

somewhat his influence upon the affairs of state; for the two departments were still regarded as the same divine institution. Calvin's interest, however, was strictly religious. He expected the study of the Scriptures to produce the perfect Christian who would be able to establish the theocratic State.

In the words of John Lord, "Calvin was a high-churchman in his spirit, both in reference to the divine institution of the Presbyterian form of government and the ascendency of the Church as a great power in the world. Yet such was the course of events, that Calvin was the instrument for bringing about in practice several things that were the exact opposite of what he believed in and aimed at."

The separation of Church and State was no part of his program. But as soon as he had the power to do so, Calvin gave to the City Council of Geneva the right to choose elders and confirm the election of ministers; by dispensing with bishops, archdeacons, deans, and the like, he practically broke down the caste system represented in the Roman hierarchy. Every man that preached the gospel was soon regarded by the people as a presbyter or elder; and every presbyter was free to become a bishop. In the Presbyterian system that he adopted, he maintained that the Church is represented by both clergy and laity, and that an *exact parity* exists between them as Christians and as members of the same organization; and he gave to the congregation, in conjunction with the clergy, the right of excommunication. Thus he built up an ecclesiastical system that proved fatal to all such autocratic power as existed in the Imperial Church of Rome. For the purpose of

securing spiritual authority that should belong to a true priesthood, he sought the moral power of personal superiority in bearing, intelligence, and sanctity — such as had characterized the uncorrupted monks. No man ever fought sacerdotalism, as mere religious machinery, more fiercely and more successfully than did Calvin.''

As the logical result of private judgment concerning the meaning of the Scriptures, the reformers found themselves in a dilemma from which it was not easy to extricate themselves. ''If I had known what was before me,'' said Luther, ''ten horses could not have drawn me into it.'' The watchwords ''grace'' and ''faith'' and ''the Bible'' with their many conflicting opinions were essentially divisive; and they recognized no unifying principle to unite the dissenters in thought, sympathy, and action, into one harmonious organization. Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Melanchthon, and others were soon widely separated in opinion, purpose, and even friendship; for it is said that Luther rejoiced at the news of Zwingli's death.

The feeling of hostility that arose among the reformers was due to the fact that they themselves had no just estimate of the nature and the effect upon the masses of the principle advocated, ''the right of private judgment concerning the meaning of the Scriptures.'' They straightway began to deny to others the right of Scriptural interpretation whenever an interpretation conflicted with their own opinions. As soon as a small group of like-minded persons were clothed with sufficient power, they began to suppress original thinking by heresy trials and persecutions. It is stated that even Calvin, after he had failed ''to set Servetus right in theology, gladly consented that

the tribunal of Vienna should condemn the heretic to be burned alive."

"The emancipated mind," says Guizot, "was a fact rather than a recognized principle; a result, rather than an intention on the part of the reformers. When they were accused of persecution, they were troubled to defend themselves, and they used the plea *of necessity*; they had, they said, the right to repress and punish error, because they alone were in the possession of the truth. Their articles of belief and their institutions, they contended, were the only legitimate ones; and if the Church of Rome had not a right to punish the reform party, it was because she was in the wrong, and they were in the right. When dissenting sects separated themselves from the dominant party, the seceders denounced by the abandoned party replied, 'We are doing just what you did; we separated ourselves from you, just as you separated yourselves from the Church of Rome,' The ruling party still more at a loss to find an answer, frequently answered by increasing severity of penalty."

In judging our forebears, we must keep in mind that with their lack of historic perspective they did not realize, as does the reformer of the twentieth century, that independent thinking, until checked by a higher unifying desire of some kind, leads to radical individualism, unlimited and hostile sectarianism, and hopeless unsocial anarchy.

Reviewing the controversies of the reformers, we find that the first point in dispute among them was the Eucharist. Luther himself was not wholly emancipated from the teachings of the Roman Church; but Calvin openly denied the real presence of Christ in the sacrament;

he regarded it as a symbol of divine influence —"the means by which grace is imparted, and a mirror in which to contemplate Christ." The dogma of transubstantiation was rejected by the reformers, who claimed to be unable to find a Scriptural sanction for such a doctrine.

Baptism was regarded by Calvin as an indication of divine grace, but not essential to salvation. On this subject he differed from Luther and the Church of Rome and some of the modern denominations. Also Calvin's requirements for church-membership were not rigid. They were simply faith in God, and faith in Jesus Christ as the Savior of men. But he still believed in "spiritual coercion," and he himself resorted to excommunication as a discipline. "It is the only weapon," he said, "that the Church can use to bind men together." However, he urged that the excommunicated be made the subject of special prayer by the faithful, and recommended that anathema should be seldom pronounced.

Calvin's great theological treatise was *The Institutes,* and he distinguished himself in the advocacy of the doctrine of "Predestination." As a writer, he was consistent in his strict adherence to the Bible. He built up the theology of his system by acknowledging no master but Christ; and he accepted without question whatever he thought the Scriptures implied. From the Bible as he interpreted it, he drew conclusions with irresistible logic. His treatise is so exhaustive that there is no subject that any reformer or theoligian had ever treated that he did not touch upon. As Athanasius had defended the Trinity, and Luther had overturned the practice of penance for half of Europe, so Calvin emphasized the idea of Predestination. The dogma,

however, was not original with him. It had been well expounded by Saint Augustine in the fourth century. His advocacy of "the sovereingty of God" in the sixteenth century intensified the discussion of the great Thought-epoch and brought out the protest of the anti-Calvinists, or the Arminians who advocated "free grace," a doctrine which places upon each individual the responsibility for working out his own destiny — a doctrine regarded by many, both then and now, as none the less Scriptural and reasonable than that of Predestination.

Upon this subject, John Lord has said: "Theologians and philosophers have ever been divided into two great schools of thought — those who have a tendency to exalt the dignity of man; and those who would absorb him in the greatness of the Deity. These two schools have both advocated doctrines which carried out to their ultimate consequences would produce a Grecian humanitarianism on the one hand, and a sort of Bramanism on the other hand — the one making man the arbiter of his own destiny; the other making Deity the only power in the Universe."

A study of the creeds of Christendom today shows that under other names, Calvinism and Arminianism have both been taught and are still taught, in the Roman Church as well as by the Protestant sects. Calvin and his followers accepted the teaching of Saint Augustine, while Arminius held to the opposite opinion. The matter of metaphysical theology may be briefly summed up in a few sentences as follows: Imperialism and Democracy came into conflict in the Church at the time of the Reformation. Wherever one idea of authority prevailed, the other had to give way, although the difference was not necessarily in the interpretation of the meaning of the Scriptures.

John Calvin yielded up his spirit to his Maker on May 27, 1554. "Though dead, he yet speaketh." His name is linked with the greatest movements of modern civilization. He has been called "the Father of Representative Government" as it is employed on the American continent, because such a system of government resulted from his religious teachings concerning the rights of man. He seems to have had two distinct missions in life. His service to the Church was a conscious one; his service to the State was unconscious, but of great value. However defective his system of theology may seem to the present age, the whole world owes him a debt of gratitude for transmitting to posterity the principle of representative government applicable alike to Church and State.

The constructive forces of Protestantism continued and became increasingly active after the demise of Calvin. A conspicuous example of efforts at creed-making, by stating religious opinions upon metaphysical subjects in terms of the Scriptures, is found in the framing of "the Westminster Confession of faith," and two catechisms. This achievement, begun in the year 1643, required five and a half years for its completion. Such an undertaking marks the seventeenth century as belonging to a great Thought-epoch of the Second Period of Creedal Christianity.

Some facts to be remembered in the study of the history of Protestantism are the following: Nearly three-quarters of a century after the death of John Calvin, we find that his doctrines had taken root on English soil and the sovereigns of England have become the head of "the Established Church of England." The Calvinists desired a form of worship further removed from that of Romanism than had

been adopted by the English Church. State and Church were still united under the principle of "the divine right of kings to rule both Church and State." The Calvinists (now called in derision Puritans, on account of their desire for a purely spiritual form of worship) were forbidden to attend upon the ministry of any clergyman other than that of the Established Church. To such spiritual tyranny the Puritans refused to conform, and they were called "non-conformists." The non-conformists were soon engaged in a struggle with King Charles I in order to secure religious liberty. The two parties engaged in the strife were the Cavaliers who defended the king, and the Puritans who opposed the king. The Puritan party was strong in numbers, but was divided into two factions — the Presbyterians and the Independents. The Presbyterians desired to adopt the Presbyterian system of religion and to limit the authority of the kings; the more radical Independents desired to secure religious freedom for all and to found a Republic in England. In the year 1643 the Presbyterians were in the majority in Parliament; and they called together a body of men, known as the Westminster Assembly, mentioned above, who were to formulate a creed in terms of the Scriptures. The delegates appointed by Parliament were made up of one hundred and twenty divines, eleven lords, twenty commoners, and seven commissioners from Scotland. The delegates were men conspicuous for learning, eloquence, and piety; among them were professors not only of sacred but of secular science; deans, masters, and heads of colleges, vice-chancellors from great universities; orators, statesmen, hymnists, besides theologians — all of the number were men well qualified to

embody in a confession of faith the opinions of the intellectual age of Cromwell, Hampden, and George Fox, the Quaker, who arose in the midst of the confusion to announce the then strange doctrine of "The Brotherhood of all men."

To assist them, the Assembly had all of the creeds of the past. The making of a confession of faith was no new work to the members of the Assembly. Fourteen of the number were themselves authors of excellent books. Theirs was an age trained beyond any previous one in constructing doctrinal manuals for the instruction of the people. All that long training could give in mental discipline, the Assembly had in preparation for the task. More than that, they agreed that "The supreme judge by which all controversies of religion, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits are to be examined, and in whose sentences we are to rest, can be no other than the Holy Spirit speaking through the Scriptures."

Early in the session, a committee of known proficients was appointed to undertake the work. They made a report in due time, but it was not accepted by the Assembly. New members were added to the committee. After much deliberation, a second report was substituted. Still the Assembly was not satisfied. The committee was again changed. After long labor, a third report was presented. For three months the longer catechism was under discussion, review, and revision. It was approved almost to the end, when again the Assembly became dissatisfied, and decided to make a fourth effort to secure something nearer perfection. The committee was again

reconstructed with a larger addition of numbers. It was instructed to prepare two catechisms — a short one for beginners, and a longer one for more advanced students. But in spite of past labor, nearly two years more of alternate report and revision were required before both catechisms were acceptable. The longer one was completed first. The Shorter Catechism was the last work of the Westminster Assembly, and their greatest achievement — "the consummate flower of all their toil."

According to popular tradition, the definition of God was born of prayer. To the question, "What is God?" the committee found themselves unable to give a satisfactory answer. The question was then referred to a Committee of the Whole. They, too, had failed to find an answer. Then a member was called upon to pray for divine enlightenment. He began thus: "O God Who art a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in Thy Being, Wisdom and Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness, and Truth." When this matchless invocation fell upon their ears, the Assembly felt that God's own description of Himself had been given in prayer in answer to prayer.

The consensus of opinion concerning the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures and expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith may be taken as a representative democratic document; although some of the more than two hundred existing creeds contradict their statements, while others amplify and clarify the intended meaning.

Thus we find that Christendom today possesses two standard creeds, both the result of the best thought of the age that produced them — the one made by the authority of the Roman Council of Nicea; the other, by an Assembly

of Englishmen seeking to express their Christian faith in the phraseology of the Holy Scriptures as advocated by Martin Luther, the Leader of the Reformation.

Looking back over the four hundred years of Protestant denominationalism, we may ask, What has been accomplished by the long years of discussion, intolerance, and persecution of Christian by Christian? The two hundred sects must reply, "The United States has secured liberty of conscience in religion for all her citizens at so high a price that for the present age to become intolerant toward any Christian sect would be to become a renegade from the Religion of the Spirit as taught by the Christ, and a traitor to the American Flag. And by the guidance of the Holy Spirit we pledge to write upon the pages of future history a sequel to the story worthy of the heroic struggles of our Forefathers."

CHAPTER IV

MEDIEVAL THEOLOGY AND MODERN SCIENCE

Among the many influences traceable in the historic development of Christianity and its civilization are two powerful currents of thought that have constantly modified Christian theology. The one is the Renaissance of Humanistic Learning which has culminated in Modern Science; the other is the indomitable sufficiency of the Spirit which, in spite of persecution by Popery, Prelacy, and Protestantism, has flourished on the confines and within churches of all denominations, and has thus secured spiritual progress.

The Renaissance gave one interpretation to human life, and the Puritan phase of Protestantism gave another — "each tendency making a prolonged quest for dissimilar nuggets of golden Truth and proceeding with rich treasures toward opposite goals of deposit." The scientific spirit of the Revival of Learning, which began in the fifteenth century, sought to make conquest of the material forces of nature and to harness them as subjugated servants for all humanity; the mystical piety that survived in the Puritanism of England and America, in Quakerism, in Wesleyanism, and in the Pietists of Germany and other countries sought, above all else, self-mastery. In order to make conquests of their own souls and secure happiness beyond the grave their lives became a ceaseless

battle between good and evil, right and wrong conduct. The scientific tendencies led to a spirit of this-worldliness, and the mystical tendencies conserved the medieval spirit of other-worldliness.

Thus arose a series of controversies, persecutions, and heresy trials, known as "The Conflict between Science and Religion."

First, came the war between Theology and the New Astronomy as set forth by Copernicus. This great German astronomer, born in the year 1473, was a contemporary as well as a countryman of Martin Luther. A mere outline of this tale of warfare between bigoted ignorance and the spirit of free inquiry concerning the heavenly bodies is as follows: Copernicus occupied thirty years of his life in the preparation of a book in which he explained the Solar System as we understand it today — the solid structure of astronomy that bears his name. For more than a dozen years after the completion of his book, he delayed its publication in order to avoid the popular outcry against himself; for he knew that the author of new truths that impugned time-honored dogmas of the Roman Church would be regarded as a heretic and subjected to anathema and excommunication. Yielding to the importunities of his friends, he finally consented to the publication of his book, *De Orbum Caelestium Revolutionibus,* which contained his conception of the Solar System. His treatise was published at Nürnberg, under the supervision of his trusted disciple, Rheticus. In order to avoid the accusation of opposing the authority of the Church, Copernicus dedicated his book to Pope Paul III, "hoping," he said, "if His Holiness approves of it, he will protect the author from the baneful

tooth of calumny.'' Strange to relate, as soon as the book was sent to press Copernicus, who for seventy years had enjoyed the best of health, was suddenly stricken in mind and body. He lingered in a semi-paralytic state until a copy of his epoch-making work was placed in his hands. Upon accepting a copy of his book, he immediately revived and seemed to be conscious that he was in possession of the precious child of his own brain. Then he suddenly relapsed into a state of insensibility that terminated in his death on May 24, 1543. Thus by reason of his natural death, Copernicus was saved from the possibility of martyrdom for the cause of scientific Truth.

A few years after his death in Germany, there was born in Italy one, Giordano Bruno, the philosopher and defender of Copernicus, who gave offence to the Church and became a martyr to astronomic fact. And if any one was to be condemned for promulgating this theory of the Solar System, it is not surprising that Bruno should have been selected as the victim; for he openly ridiculed Biblical cosmogony as the absurd fancies of the childish minds of primitive peoples. It has been truthfully said: ''The discovery that the sun, not the earth, is the center of the Solar System, and that all the fixed stars are suns identical in their nature with our own Solar System, was indeed most disconcerting to the clergy of the time who claimed to be authority upon all subjects.'' The sequel to the tragic story of the battle between fact and fancy concerning the motions of the heavenly bodies may be stated in a single sentence: After having been confined in an inquisitorial prison for seven years, on the 17th of February, 1600, Bruno was burned at the stake in Rome by order of the Imperial Church.

The life and labors of Bruno, however, were not in vain. His concept of "the unity and continuity of all things" showed to succeeding dogmatists in the Roman Church the necessity for accepting well known facts concerning the Cosmos. By their labors and courageous lives, Copernicus and Bruno and their followers dealt the death blow to Ptolemaic Astronomy and the medieval theology that was *supposed* to rest upon it as the foundation of Christianity.

Although there have been ignorant and bigoted churchmen down the centuries of progress who have regarded every scientific discovery and the statement of a reign of immutable laws governing the universe, as equivalent to teaching atheism, the Bible has ceased to be regarded as authority on astronomy. Few, if any, in any land today reject the Copernican System of astronomy. This discovery of the laws of the revolution of the heavenly bodies is no longer suspected of giving offence to Jesus of Nazareth by overthrowing His system of ethical and spiritual teachings. On the contrary, the thinking classes of all Christendom in our age regard the interpreters of nature as the true High Priests of the Ruler of the Universe, who are thinking His thoughts after Him. The facts of astronomy and the revelation of infinite interstellar space serve to extend the God-consciousness of the human mind as nothing else can do. The law of gravitation, explaining the mystery of the method whereby the Creator holds in the hollow of His hand myriads of systems of suns, declares the glory of God in a measure inconceivable to the poetic fancy of the Psalmist of old.

A second illustration of the conflict between Science and Religion occupied the middle of the nineteenth cen-

tury. This epoch was made memorable by the war waged by churchmen upon the two great discoveries of the age — the Law of Organic Evolution, and the Discovery of the Antiquity of the Earth. Darwin readily convinced the scientists of his time of the truth of "the slow evolution of the organic kingdom by the operation of the law of natural selection." Likewise the geologists secured from the records of the rocks convincing evidences of the antiquity of the earth. Yet the conceited bigots of the Church arose to declaim against the new teaching as "putting God out of the universe and teaching atheism." It was but yesterday that Protestantism itself was divided into two hostile camps — evolutionists and their opponents. The one faction was sympathetic with the conception; the other, was disputatious. It is true that the emancipated democratic spirit of the nineteenth century did not demand that any apostle of evolution should be burned at the stake for opinion's sake; but the fires of indignation burned fiercely in the breast of bigoted churchmen who hurled vituperative epithets against the defenders of facts that impugned the age-long teachings of the Church, alike Romanists and Protestants.

The dispassionate minds of all ages realize that such opposition was due neither to the nature of science nor the nature of Christianity as taught by the Christ: but that it arose from human egotism that dislikes all ideas and all persons who undertake to unmask their most sacred illusions. Notwithstanding the progress that has been made in scientific knowledge, there are still individuals who are convinced of the non-existence of everything in the universe prior to six thousand years of Biblical history

— although it is well known by all students of history that the Scriptures furnish only a brief and incomplete account of the Hebrew people for a short time.

The majority of persons of all denominations accept the theory of evolution as the most *probable* explanation of the plan of creation; but two popular misconceptions still hinder progress in the Church in some localities. One of these misconceptions is concerning the false assertion that "Man descended from a pair of monkeys." Such a statement no evolutionist has ever made. The second misconception is the idea that "The process of evolution contradicts the Bible and leaves no place in thought for God, and hence is atheistic." These crude ideas of the Creator and His creation are often inculcated into the minds of children by misinformed parents and Sunday School teachers, and are thus perpetuated from generation to generation. Such being the case, the duty devolves upon those who have charge of religious education today to become correctly informed upon the relation between the teachings of the Bible and Modern Science.

In order to make clear to any inquirer the exact meaning of Evolution, its definition, as formulated by the American scientist, Joseph Le Conte, is here introduced. He says: "Evolution means continuous progressive changes, according to fixed laws (differentiation, cyclic movement, and progress of the whole) by means of resident forces." What the evolutionist teaches concerning the origin of species is this: On his physical side, man is related to some being whose ancestry, if traced back far enough into the past, would be found to be closely related to the ape. That is, man and a being (the missing link)

closely related to the ape, had a common origin in the beginning of evolution in the Great Sea of Life when the creative word was spoken.

Furthermore, evolution implies involution; nothing can be evolved that was not first *involved.* The fiat of the spoken word "in the beginning" is one side of the creative act and the other side is still going on toward a purposeful goal divinely planned. The continuous progressive changes, through long periods of geological time, represent the creative efforts of the Supreme Being in the past; and the process of unfoldment now going on is proof of the sustaining power of an immanent Deity. The past and the present furnish unmistakable promises of a glorious future of perpetual progress for the human race. Instead then of setting bounds to thought and imagination and thereby narrowing and cheapening conceptions of an Omnipotent Creator, theistic evolution rises to the sublime conception of "the unity and continuity of all things." The fact of continuous changes and perpetual progress throughout an eternity of eternities, presents to the mind's eye a gigantic panorama of mammoth proportions which defy the power of human speech to describe.

For lack of scientific knowledge, misconceptions have arisen also concerning man's place in nature and the natural relationship of human beings to each other in the great chain of animate creation. Looked at from the standpoint of evolution, man is a part of nature, and the brotherhood of man is an indisputable fact of physical life. No man is a detached being; neither is any race wholly different from the others, whatever may be its physical, mental, or moral peculiarities. "No man liveth

unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself." Through parentage every soul is bound to the race by a complex network of ancestry. It is literally true when rightly understood, "In Adam's fall we sinned all, and in Christ all are made alive."

It is a rational and hopeful inference from the law of evolution that the Divine Man, exemplified in the Christ, is the terminal fact in the stupendous process of unfoldment whereby all things have come to be just what they now are. From the physical and spiritual standpoint, the brotherhood of man is a fact in nature. This information is the most important contribution that Modern Science can make to Christendom in this crucial hour in the history of civilization — the hour when the effort is being made to establish a reign of international law in a league of nations. It is evident that peace on earth and good-will among men can be secured and maintained only when the natural relationship among all races of men is recognized, and the necessity is seen for the immediate application of the principle, "Each for all, and all for each."

Summarizing the facts contained in the foregoing pages of this chapter, we find that Christian civilization owes its material progress largely to the courageous spirit of heretics and martyrs. They it was who broke the yoke of Roman Imperialism in the Church that strove to curb free inquiry into the mysteries of nature and God. It is but a common-place comment to say concerning *applied science,* she has tunnelled mountains; spanned rivers; delved into the bowels of the earth; dredged the bottom of the sea; and soared aloft in the air; that she has harnessed steam and electricity; accelerated motion; annihilated distance; allevi-

ated pain; and lengthened human life — all these achievements and many more of our age are too well known to demand more than a mere mention.

Modern science has gone further: she has dissolved matter into molecules; molecules, into atoms; atoms into electrons; and electrons into energy. She has eliminated the dread of uncertainty and chance from the universe by disclosing the operations of universal and immutable laws — laws applicable alike to the visible and the invisible worlds. She has declared the whole universe to be alive — a Living Organism gradually unfolding a Life Principle which manifests itself in various forms — beginning with minerals, passing to vegetation, then to animals, and last to man — the Masterpiece of creation exemplified in the Divine Man, the Christ. The lenses of the telescope and the microscope, and the chemist's retort have banished many a superstition from the minds of men, and thus opened the way for the Religion of the Spirit.

The two opposite currents of thought that made themselves manifest in the fifteenth century, where we began the survey of tendencies, have apparently now completed their circuit and are alike lost in the mystery of the invisible and unknown. From century to century, while adding abundantly to material wealth, Modern Science has likewise so clarified religious concepts as to make the Modern Church of Christ an indispensable agency for the elevation of the race into a new and better form of civilization.

The achievements of the united efforts may be summed up into the single phrase, "the extension of the God-consciousness of the human soul." This extended consciousness has produced a new theology; a new science of

God and man; a new concept of creation; and thus produced a new earth and a new heaven. The spiritualized Christian of today recognizes, or may recognize, the immanence of God in his own soul — a Divine Presence "closer than breathing, nearer than hand or foot," an omnipotent, omnicient, and omnipresent Father Who never sleeps nor slumbers and Who watches over His creatures with more vigilance and tenderness than is possible to any human parent.

The concept of geological time — the ages and eons covering millions of solar years required to make the earth a fit abode for man — serves to so widen, deepen, and elevate the thoughts of men so as to enable them to conceive of both an eternity in the past and an eternity of eternities yet to come.

The mystery of the structure of the atom and the electron; the nature of the radiation of heat, light, and the X-Ray; and the elusive ether of space — all these secrets of nature doubtless will challenge continuous free inquiry and persistent investigation for countless centuries to come. The indomitable spirit of research does not regard the unknown as unknowable; the achievements of the past testify that "There is nothing hidden that shall not be revealed."

Those who still claim that they find a conflict between the scientific interpretation of nature and the teachings of the Bible are asked to view the matter as follows: Here are two books written by the same author upon entirely different subjects. The Book of Nature deals with organic evolution and material forms; the Bible deals with the moral and spiritual evolution of those who accept the

Hebrew Scriptures as the inspired Word of God and make them their only rule of faith and practice. How, then, can there be a conflict between two books written for two different purposes by the same author?

In the last analysis, the apparent conflict between the Bible and the teachings of modern science resolves itself into a question of interpretations. The apparent discrepancy may arise either from a misconception of the meaning of the facts of Nature, or from a false interpretation of the words of the sacred Scriptures, or, possibly, from a misapprehension of the meaning of both books, each filled with innumerable mysteries impenetrable by the finite mind.

Today every emancipated mind rejoices that the right of personal interpretations of both books, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience are guaranteed to all our citizens by the Constitution of the United States of America. These personal rights ever have been, and ever will be, held sacred by the Spirit of Democracy, Protestantism, and Christianity as taught by Jesus of Nazareth, the imperishable "Light of the World."

CHAPTER V

UNIFYING FORCES DISCOVERED

Since millions of individuals were now studying the Scriptures and exercising the right of private judgment concerning their meaning, an age of polemics naturally followed the revolt of Martin Luther. In those controversial days, the chief use made of the Bible seems to have been to prove some pre-conceived opinion of the debaters concerning some of the dogmas of the Roman Church from which emancipated minds had not yet freed themselves. Hence for three centuries the chief characteristics of Protestantism were divisive intellectualism, a constant growth of sects, hostilities among communions, and heresy trials. So bigoted was the spirit of the times, that thousands of Protestants who would gladly have welcomed all men into the sect of their own approval would have declined with indignation an invitation to share the hospitality of any other denomination or to engage in any coöperative Christian activity of any community. Although the divisive tendencies were lamented by all, at that time (as now) Christian unity upon a creedal basis would have been impossible; and unity upon any other than a basis of personal opinion was suggested by none of the sects.

But inevitable changes were gradually and unconsciously taking place. Sectarian hostilities were becoming less marked and a period of indifference to Church affiliations set in.

However, accomplished facts show that allegiance to the Bible as the source of authority in religion — the basis of Protestantism — was a real though unconscious unifying force; and the common desire among Protestants to put the Scriptures, knowledge of which was necessary to the soul's salvation, into the homes of all people furnished a practical basis for one important coöperative activity early in the nineteenth century.

This imperious desire among Protestants led to the founding of The Inter-denominational Bible Society in the year 1816. This society soon became international in the scope of its activities. In surveying the achievements of the American and British societies alone, we find that the whole Bible has now been translated into ninety different tongues, and can be read, in part, by three hundred and twenty of the many dialects and languages that still separate men and nations in thought and purposes. It is said that various translations now make the Holy Scriptures accessible to nine-tenths of the inhabitants of the earth; and that their publication has reached the rate of over six millions of copies annually. The International Bible Society is a colossal monument that Time has reared to the memory of the anathematized Wyclif; and the wisdom of producing a vernacular form of the Scriptures advocated by Luther, is now fully vindicated.

A second coöperative activity — the organization of The American Tract Society — soon followed as a logical consequence of the work of the colporteurs who distributed the Bibles among the people. The influence of this religious literature circulated in thousands of channels impossible to trace, and the potency of the printed page illumined by

the Holy Spirit in unsuspected places became a unifying force whose value can not be estimated or even imagined.

A third unsectarian undertaking — The American Sunday School Union — officered by members of various denominations, was organized about the year 1824. It had for its purpose the establishment of Bible Schools in sparsely settled districts of the West and Southwest. For many years the Sunday School Union acted as a pioneer in civilization and as a recruiting agency for all denominations. For many years it had to its credit the organization of an average of four schools per day. During the many years of its activities it has enrolled an enormous total of schools, teachers, and pupils impossible to report. The attitude of this body of workers has always been one of loyalty to all denominations, and it has furnished a guardianship to the interests of all denominations as circumstances seemed to require.

The earliest fruitful effort to form a closer international union among Protestant denominations was organized in London in 1846. It was called "The Evangelical Alliance," and an American branch of the organization was formed in 1867.

Following a conference of this Evangelical Alliance held in New York City in the year 1873 the American sects entered upon a period of active coöperation. Year by year, they have been coming into closer fellowship along all lines of common service. Of this spirit of comity have been born the Young Men's Christian Association in the year 1851; the Young Woman's Christian Association in the year 1858; the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in the year 1874; the Christian Endeavor in the year 1881;

and the Students' Volunteer Movement in the year 1886. All of these and many other world-wide interdenominational movements are too well known to require a single word of explanation. These examples of denominational coöperation show that the nineteenth century witnessed the breaking down, by means of fraternal activities, of much of the hostile and divisive sectarianism that characterized the earlier centuries of Protestantism.

Christian fellowship is also illustrated by the many charitable and reform movements organized outside of the churches from a common feeling of community needs, irrespective of church affiliations. One of the oldest and most important of these is the American Peace Scoiety founded in the year 1828, which, from the nature of the cause, is an international movement of a semi-political character. It is founded upon the principle of good-will among men, and has for its object the abolition of wars as an accredited means of settling international disputes. In this list of secular organizations belong a large number of beneficiary orders founded for mutual service for all included in the fraternity regardless of denominational lines. This long list may be illustrated by the significant names, "The Woodmen of the World," and the feminine equivalent, "The Royal Neighbors," — all showing the sense of common needs among people of all classes.

The most important interdenominational organization, numerically considered, is "The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ." Several pioneers in coöperative efforts performed services of inestimable value; but space forbids more than a mere mention of three organizations intimately connected with the convening of a Conference

in the year 1905. The preliminaries required for the convocation are as follows: In the year 1894, "The Open and Institutional Church League" was formed in New York City; in 1895, the churches of the City of New York were federated; in 1901, these two organizations were merged into what was called "The National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers." This was a voluntary and unofficial organization of individuals rather than of churches.

The movements toward final federation were as follows: A committee from "The National Council of Congregational Churches" asked the National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers to arrange for a conference of all evangelical communions for the autumn of 1905. The matter was undertaken; and after a study of the Christian denominations, the Correspondence Committee of New York City decided, "As the first step, to bring into conference only those denominations which were then in fraternal relations and in substantial agreement as to fundamental Christian doctrines." A letter of invitation was accordingly sent out asking the delegates to convene at Carnegie Hall in New York City on November 15, 1905.

Twenty-eight replies to the latter missive accepted the invitation and authorized the executive committee of The National Federation of Churches and Christian Workers to formulate a plan of federation to be discussed by delegates sent, and to arrange a program of representative speakers. These delegates were chosen and sent forth to participate in the Conference with the understanding that they were expected to be loyal only to Christ as the Head of the Church, visible and invisible.

The plan of federation adopted is, in part, as follows: "Whereas, in the Providence of God, the time has come when it seems fitting more fully to manifest the essential Oneness of the Christian Churches of America, and believing in Jesus Christ as their divine Lord and Savior, to promote the spirit of fellowship, service, and coöperation among them, the delegates to The Inter-Church Conference of Federation, assembled in New York City, do hereby recommend the following plan of Federation to Christian bodies represented in the Conference for approval:

"I—For the prosecution of work that can be done better in union than in separation, a Council is hereby established whose name shall be the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

"II—The objects of the Federal Council shall be,

1. To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Churches.
2. To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.
3. To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the Churches.
4. To secure a larger combination of influence for the Churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social conditions of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.
5. To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council and to promote its aims in their community."

The late Dr. William H. Roberts of the Presbyterian

Church of Philadelphia has summed up the nature of the achievement of 1905 in the following words: "Allow me to emphasize the fact that this Conference is a unique historical gathering. It is the most notable assembly of believers ever held in connection with the interests of the Kingdom of Christ. This Conference is composed of delegates of thirty national churches of America, Europe, and Africa, and through representatives of missionary jurisdiction of the several Churches, of the whole world. Here sit together representatives of churches which have their sources in the great national churches of England, Scotland, Holland, Germany, and other lands. I venture to add three things concerning the nature of our union: That we are organized in antagonism to no body of persons claiming the name of Christian. We cherish for all the charity described in the 13th Chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and illustrated in the life of our divine Lord and Savior.

"That we are ready to coöperate as an organization with good men of all creeds and races for the moral uplift of mankind, both at home and abroad. Having in our ranks, unity in spirit and aims, we can heartily assist in every good cause."

The year 1908 witnessed a second federation of another group of denominations, "The National Federation of Religious Liberals." Since the Liberals comprise a small number of denominations but little known, the question is often asked, What constitutes one a liberal in religion? To this inquiry, Rev. William Channing Gannett has given the following reply: "The four corner stones upon which we build are: Freedom, Fellowship, Service, and Character.

This means freedom of reason and conscience instead of tradition and authority; fellowship of the Spirit of Christ instead of a fellowship of sectarianism; service for others, instead of salvation for self alone; and that the test of Christian discipleship is Christian character, instead of a mere adherence to any form of ecclesiasticism."

Liberalism in the United States has also a short and interesting history. So far had the idea of coöperation taken possession of all classes during the nineteenth century, that in the year 1866 (the year that the Evangelical Alliance was formed in New York) the Free Religious Association was organized in Boston. It was intended to be "an open and critical and aggressive protest against denominational narrow-mindedness and the reactionary tendencies of the times." Ralph Waldo Emerson was the first to enroll himself a member. The object of the organization is stated to be: "To encourage the scientific study of religion and ethics; to advocate freedom in religion; to increase fellowship in spirit; and to emphasize the supremacy of a practical morality in all relations of life. Membership in the Association leaves each individual responsible only for his own opinions, and affects in no degree his relation to other associations."

With the foregoing explanation of Liberalism in Christianity, we are able to understand the nature of "The National Federation of Religious Liberals" effected in 1908. It is founded upon a basis of spiritual union or spiritual affinities among individuals of any, and all, or no denominational affiliation. It comprises a number of small and dissimilar sects excluded from the Federation of 1905. Some of the sects are Reformed Jews, Hicksite Friends (Quak-

ers), Unitarians, and Universalists, and some others. Their stated purpose is as follows: "To promote the religious life by united testimony to sincerity expressed in social service beyond the lines of sect and creed; to unify and concentrate the forces that make for religious tolerance and progress; and to bring these forces into coöperation concerning the spiritual and ethical interests which they possess in common; to foster good-will both religious and racial, in the community; to promote a fellowship of the spirit based upon character and conduct, not on creeds and rites; and to strive for the awakening of the public conscience, the promotion of social justice, and the better performance of social service and human obligations."

Thus we find that the unifying forces that have been operating in the past are as follows: Allegiance to the Bible as authority in religion; doctrinal agreement and spiritual affinities; a sense of common community needs and interests, irrespective of church affiliations; and a common desire to save sinners and serve humanity.

A survey of the religious conditions of today in the United States discloses the fact that in accordance with "the ways the fathers trod," the more than two hundred sects of Christianity are marching in three well organized companies, distinguished by conservatism, moderately progressive movements, and radical liberalism.

This tripartite division (or rather union on broad lines) comprises the Imperial Churches of Rome and Greece; the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, together with a number of unfederated orthodox denominations; and the Religious Liberals, together with sixty-five millions of unchurched individuals as camp followers.

CHAPTER VI

CHRISTIAN UNITY AT WORK

One of the purposes of the Federation of Churches, as has been stated, is "Coöperation for the prosecution of work that can be better done in union than in separation." This general field of coöperative effort includes two distinct lines of activity: the geographical distribution of churches as the mere promulgators of Christianity; and denominational coöperation in social service for the uplift and betterment of society through interdenominational and undenominational philanthropic agencies.

The nature of the work to be undertaken among various communions was and still is both corrective and preventive. Two conspicuous defects in the distribution of churches that have resulted from lack of coöperation in the past have been designated as "overlapping" and "overlooking." By overlapping or over-churching is meant the needless duplication of churches in communities that are unable to maintain two competing organizations at their highest efficiency. These results of lack of coöperation among denominations have been exemplified on mission fields at home and abroad, in cities, hamlets, and in rural districts wherever denominational rivalry has operated to any extent. The undesirable results of over-churching are readily apparent. In communities where two or more churches exist where only one is needed, they inevitably compete, so that neither can

grow except at the expense of the other. It has been said: "Ideally the church is the unifier; but practically in many places the churches, just because they are several, are themselves the cause of friction and discord in a community. They may not intend to compete, but when several try to maintain themselves in a field sufficient only for one, they become rivals in spite of better intentions. Christians are thus separated into distinct, if not jealous, groups. Their purpose to build up the Church of Christ is vitiated by party spirit and personal feeling. They are tempted to seek men and membership as recruits to the institution. Outsiders and even the children of the churches are repelled by the evils of rivalry among sects."

Besides eliminating the bitterness that attends rivalry and competition in over-churched communities, very readily apparent advantages arise from coöperation among churches. Thereby greater efficiency is secured in matters of economy in money, time, effort, and moral and spiritual power. It has been discovered that the needless duplication of churches results in a *per capita* cost to individuals and to the entire community out of proportion to the benefits derived, while at the same time ministers are required to accept salaries inadequate to the cost of living. It has been fully demonstrated by coöperative experiments that have been made in various localities that work which various denominations have accomplished when working together costs less in cash than when each denomination has done similar work independently. Coöperation in church activities rests upon the same business foundation as "big business" in commercial lines. For example: from statistics gleaned from a survey of the churches of Massachusetts

in the year 1912 it was found that in small towns (where all could attend one church) those having but one church were paying their minister $874: towns of the same population supporting two churches were paying their minister a salary of $680 — or a total of $1,360. The total salaries paid to two ministers are alike oppressive to all; for the people pay too much for services rendered, and the pastors receive too little for their time — less than a living wage. The slogan of the hour is "Better pay for pastors for more effective services."

In order to correct the evils that have arisen from competition among denominations in the past, the spirit of comity and coöperation is needed everywhere. In certain localities the consolidation of competing churches is demanded as a unifying measure. It has been found that sometimes the consolidation of churches of the same denomination in certain geographical districts removes the evils of competition; in other cases it is found necessary for rival and competing churches of different denominations to unite for their own mutual good and for the highest good of the community.

In the effort to unify the churches the question has arisen, What is to be considered the unit in the combination? The answer that has been given is this: In the present stage of the unifying process, the *denomination* should be taken as the unit in the pan-sectarian alliances that are taking place. The purpose of retaining the name of an organization in a union church is not to strengthen numerically any particular denomination, but to give to churches of every community the advantage of coöperation with some national body and the privilege of participation

in the missionary services of the larger national body. Characteristic movements toward unification are expressed in terms of Pan-Presbyterian, Pan-Methodist, and so on, which are reunions of dissenters that have split off at one time and another for temporary or personal reasons from the larger denominations. By uniting communions into larger and larger groups, it is expected that actual federation will result, first, in the reunion of all Protestants, and finally of all Christendom.

The method to be employed in uniting local churches of different denominations also presents some difficulties. When the union of two denominations is about to take place, it is difficult to decide which denomination shall lose its identity and surrender the name. The problem has been readily solved by taking for guidance the democratic principle of "the right of the majority to rule." Thus automatically the numerically weaker of the two denominations surrenders the name. From the standpoint of unity, the formation of a new denomination and the organization of independent union churches in any community are equally deplorable. The formation of an independent union church is the equivalent of forming a new denomination — the divisive process that the spirit of unity is endeavoring to check. When two or more churches are desiring to unite as an independent organization, it has been assumed by some that when all surrender the name, none does so; but the fact remains that when all surrender the name all are cut off from fellowship and pecuniary aid of the larger national and international denominations. Such union churches are liable to become mere religious societies or clubs.

It is now generally conceded that the opposition to federation of churches comes chiefly from the pews and not from the pulpits. The obstacles encountered arise from local prejudices, personal animosities, and selfish ambitions of certain types of individuals. Although the masses of intelligent citizens desire the federation of the churches for purposes of local coöperation in service, there are still in many communities some bigoted, narrow-minded, and fossilized survivals of the polemic age of sectarianism who violently oppose progress in the churches. Such individuals seem to be spiritually disqualified to catch the vision of the glory of the reunited Church. They forget that "Whosoever loveth his life shall lose it" applies to churches with the same force as to members composing them.

Another advantage that would attend a union of the churches is the opportunity offered for specialization among the clergy in towns from three to six thousand inhabitants. Upon this subect, Rev. Dr. P. M. Simms has said: "All modern institutions except the Church employ specialists. The jack-at-all-trades can find employment only in a modern church. If the churches were federated, it would be the work of the theological seminaries to train specialists for all of the varied activities of the church. Often the best energies of local churches have been wasted entirely too much in fighting each other instead of uniting their efforts in a common cause. The Church has wasted entirely too much energy in trying to weed out heresy. There has been, is now, and always will be more or less error in the Church; and yet the truth will prevail in the end."

Another evidence that the spirit of Christian unity is at work is seen in the atmosphere of fraternity, the irenic atti-

tude, and the better understanding and greater appreciation that has come about between the conservative and the radical wing of the Protestant church. On this subject, Rev. Ambros White Vernon, D.D. (Congregationalist) spoke for the conservatives as follows: "I may venture to speak of the appreciation of the religious radical by the religious conservatives under two aspects: first, our appreciation of him for what he is; and second, for what he has done. The liberal manifests to us the rights of the individual soul. It is only by faith in personality, which the great forces of the universe have been in such long continued travail to produce, that we can overcome the world. In this age manhood fades out, save as it is based on that self-reliance and self-reverence of which Emerson was both apostle and saint. In the presence of a radical, we begin to see that the very condition of human progress is adventure toward the highest, and the creation of the highest by adventure toward it.

"And then we honor the radical for what he has done as the stalwart foe of convention, religious monopoly, and snobbish pretenses. If there were no other services of the religious radical for men, he would deserve the reverence of all those who have the interest of religion at heart, for having made it clear that religion can not be institutionalized, standardized, and stereotyped, that a ritual is only a fortunate kind of religious deposit, which like a cocoon, keeps the germs of life from the devastating forces of the world until a new life shatters it and tosses it contemptuously aside."

On the other hand, the growing appreciation of the Conservatives by the Liberals (or Radicals) has been voiced by

Rev. William Channing Gannett in the following words: "A juster appreciation of each other has come about because both parties have accepted the idea of evolution in religion. The liberal used to think of the dogmas of Medieval theology as out-and-out errors; nothing was to be done with them but to disapprove, discard, and vilify them. The thing he could not do was to understand them. Now he sees the old doctrines evolved by the child-mind of Christendom in the fourth century crystallized in the great creeds of the Roman Church; then he sees them dissolved and re-crystallized in the sixteenth century. All of these forms of Christianity he regards as natural and inevitable and equally noble at the time evolved from the religious consciousness of their formulators."

The growth of Christian unity is also seen in the partial break down of the anti-Catholic spirit among Protestants. This changed attitude is due to the lapse of time: but the one thing of most recent occurrence that has contributed largely to the change of attitude is the necessity for coöperation in the popular movements of every locality. There was a time in the United States when millions of Protestants were incapable of thinking anything but evil of Roman Catholics. But the spirit of Protestants has changed. Upon this subject the late Rev. Washington Gladden has said the following: "There are now a good many Protestants who are capable of reason and justice; to them I venture to make some suggestions: Whenever you hear any of those harrowing tales about the sinister and sanguinary plots of the Roman Catholics, never let one go unchallenged. See that the matter is thoroughly investigated; and publish the facts with the names of those who have reported the

charges. Take every opportunity you can to talk with your Roman Catholic neighbors and friends about the relation of the churches. Do not shun them or cast suspicious glances on them when you meet them; shake hands with them; get acquainted with them; and talk over the whole situation with them. We may have some difficult problems to settle in our relation with them; but let us meet them, not as enemies, but as friends. If we are to have unity, we must study the things that make for peace; each party must be ready to see the good side of the other; must learn to put the best construction on the words of others; and avoid uncharitable judgments. Yes, Catholics and Protestants must be friends in the United States. No other relation is conceivable in the twentieth century in free America."

It has been discovered by the home missionaries that there has been a great amount of "overlooking" of neglected fields in the West. The result of a survey in Colorado was a great surprise even to those most familiar with western conditions in general. Whole communities were found without any adequate religious work by either Catholics or Protestants. Besides, many of the American Indians are still Sun-worshipers and pagans who have never heard of the Christ. In order to remedy the evil discovered, the various Missionary Boards have agreed to allot the entire unoccupied fields among bodies, so that each denomination represented shall feel especially responsible for a given field. Some group of churches is now responsible for every square mile of territory. Officers on the frontiers have been assured that they will receive supplies of money and men only on the condition that they adopt coöperative ways of administering the resources.

The problem of foreigners is thought by some to belong to the Atlantic coast only. Statistics show that the proportion of foreign born in some of the western states is as great as it is in New York. Professor Edward Steiner, the friend of the foreigners in our midst, has said concerning the Americanization movement the following: "The great discovery that Columbus made was not of a new world, but he discovered a continent upon which men could found a new World-Order. Her sublime policy has been the open door of Opportunity. For the maintenance of the spirit of democracy in industry, education, and religion, the Church must dare to the uttermost; for she was put into the world for that high purpose — to keep the way open for sinful man to a sinless God. The business of the Christian Church is to increase the sum of human kindness rather than the sum of human knowledge. By kindness I mean, not formal hand-shaking, but that love which breaks down barriers; love that is not afraid of the human, no matter how encased."

Strange as it may seem, the demand for a united Christendom and for a clarified creed has come largely from the unchurched at home and the non-Christians of foreign lands. It has been flung back into the faces of evangelists and missionaries when making their appeals, "When Christians themselves are agreed as to what Christianity is, then will we hear you." The part that foreign missions have played in the movement toward unity is reported by Rev. C. S. Macfarland: "It is an interesting fact that the first serious movement toward federation was in the foreign field. The Missionaries began to send back word that they could not make their way by using such confusing tongues.

They sent imperative messages that we must get together, not only to impress the gospel upon heathen, but for their own self-preservation and the salvation of Christianity. It is true that steps toward federation and social service movements are both reflex action from the field of foreign missions. Throughout the heathen world, union churches are rapidly multiplying. In India we have the South India United Church, composed of different denominations; and another federation is under headway in Central India. These federal councils are not being organized on the basis of common worship, but are being grouped by languages and dialects which people speak. The federations are formed on social units and the application of the gospel to the needs of the world. Practically all of the Mission Schools are interdenominational and federated, not only in India, Japan and the Philippines but elsewhere."

Rev. Gilbert Reid, a returned missionary of China, has reported that Christian unity is at work in China also: "I think the best way to secure religious unity is to go to China as a missionary. I started here in New York as a Presbyterian, and got through the Presbytery safely, and became the first moderator of a *union body* of all Presbyterians in China. Later we had a beautiful illustration of broad fellowship at the instigation of certain Chinese Christians in Pekin. They proposed a union meeting; and members of the Presbyterian church, the established church of England, the Greek Church and the Roman Catholic Church all assembled in the largest edifice that could be found in the city and had their religious services together. Harmony was the one object we had in mind, and nothing discordant was allowed. We came together in the spirit

of courtesy, while each man had his own convictions. I had mine, and they are just as strong after thirty years in China as when I first went out there; but I have learned to understand that there are other people who can hold to their opinions with equal tenacity, and be equally conscientious. That is what we call in China — religious toleration — the practice of respectful toleration in close and friendly association. It is simply the matter of applying the courtesy of social life to religious relations — taking the point of view of others with the belief that we need not worry about these matters of opinion so long as God does not worry about them."

CHAPTER VII

THE INTERCHURCH WORLD MOVEMENT OF NORTH AMERICA

In the year 1918, history recorded a continent-wide attempt among certain evangelical denominations to unite in a simultaneous endeavor to Win the World for Christ. This short-lived effort, known as "The Interchurch World Movement of North America," has been rightly ascribed ot the effect of the World War upon sectarianism. As is known to all, when the Caucasian race was in danger of complete self-extinction through its own ruthless and barbaric atrocities, the United States awoke to the necessity for self-defense as the only means of self-preservation and the salvation of all that had been held sacred among men and nations. And when civilization itself was confronted by the horrors of an unescapable war between the Spirit of the Christ and Anti-Christ, a realization of the suicidal policy of division among Christians was brought home to individuals, communities, and sects as never before. It has been truthfully said, "When came the sudden blow of war, it was as if all sectarian lines were wiped off of the slate of memory with a sponge soaked in human blood." Everything then stood out in a new light, assumed a new perspective, and presented a new view of the whole world's needs. The trivial and the subordinate then fell back into their rightful places. In the minds of churchmen, doc-

trines automatically arranged themselves behind duty; sects, behind service; and the Christianization of the whole world assumed paramount importance.

It is needless to recount in these pages the manner in which Jew and Gentile stood shoulder to shoulder for the preservation of the institutions of democracy — ideal Democracy, the nearest approach to the Christian (or theocratic) State yet achieved among men. At this critical moment, as never before, the churches of the United States began to realize that they are the responsible custodians of the ideal of the Brotherhood of all Men; and that to them belongs the task of transforming national hatred into universal good-will.

The conviction that some plan of concerted missionary efforts among the churches is desirable and feasible was indeed a logical inference drawn from the success of co-operative activity among the allied armies of the World War. Hence, closely following the signing of the Armistice at Sanis, France, on November 11, 1918, the American churches (that had been unable to prevent war among the Christian nations) awoke to a sense of responsibility for the speedy reëstablishment of peace among the warring nations.

The immediate purpose of the Interchurch World Movement of North America, as stated by its leaders, was as follows: "Coöperation and simultaneous effort among evangelical churches to discover the world's needs and minister to them in the spirit of the Christ, regardless of ecclesiastical divisions or differences of opinions upon theological questions."

The beginning of the movement as recorded on the pages

of history is as follows: In December of the year 1918 a call came for a conference to consider plans for a united and simultaneous effort to accomplish the work for which the evangelical denominations felt themselves to be responsible. This call came from the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterians, South. It was addressed to similar boards and interests of the United States and Canada. The meeting place was New York, where one hundred and thirty-five persons assembled in response to the call. The work accomplished by these volunteers was the appointment of a committee charged with the task of formulating a preliminary statement that would serve as a basis for future action. The entire year of 1919 was given over to an effort to make clear to the people of the United States and Canada the scope, purpose, and methods of the movement. How far they succeeded in reaching all classes can not be readily determined; yet the outlines of those plans are too well known to all readers today to need further elaboration in these pages.

Concerning the work, Rev. Cornelius H. Patton, D.D. has said: "The aim of The Interchurch Movement is spiritual and practical. It disclaims any responsibility in realms of doctrine and polity. Organic Union is not its purpose. Its object can be accomplished without alteration of creed or polity. No co-operating board need change its structure, or consolidate with any other board. The Movement takes the framework of denominational organizations as it finds them. Undoubtedly many leaders and advocates believe in denominational federation, if not in organic union. They would welcome any well considered steps in that direction; but as for the Interchurch Movement, it seeks to become a

league of service, not of belief or administration. The world can not wait to settle all its difficulties of an intellectual and ecclesiastical nature; the world demands the simple gospel of helpfulness in the name of Christ. What is aimed at is a program of advance in which each branch of the church shall perform its task not in isolation, but as a part of the whole."

This stupendous and daring enterprise is indeed the most comprehensive and practical scheme of world-wide evangelism and home and foreign missionary effort ever undertaken by the Protestant churches of America. A drive planned for the Spring of the year 1920 to secure contributions to a budget necessary to carry on the work (regarded as the first step) was undertaken with fervor and carried forward with as great a degree of success as should have been expected at a time when all true patriots of small means had contributed cash, time, and laborious services to the point of painful self-sacrifice. Yet, as twenty centuries ago the Master tested the sincerity of the rich young man by his willingness to sell his possessions and minister to the poor and needy, so likewise in this 1918 movement money was assumed to be "the acid test" of sincerity and loyalty to the cause of Winning the World for Christ. It is a heartening fact that the membership of the denominations enlisted in the cause stood the test with marvelous uniformity. The sum of money contributed and pledged was amazing. It is a well known fact that many individuals who were unable to see the way clear to provide for their own households pledged annual payments through faith that the money would come to them from some unknown source — because it was their

conviction that the undertaking was the most important that could be conceived.

But the call for money was the minor part of the work both undertaken and accomplished. Programs for extended and thorough surveys to discover the needs of all classes of every community so as to prevent over-lapping and over-looking, and to determine the most economical expenditure of money, time, and moral and spiritual power, became at once the order of the day. The importance of the informations obtained from these surveys, and the interest in their neighbors aroused among all classes can not be overestimated; for the discovery of the actual needs of every community is always the first step towards ministering to them.

In this connection it is fitting to state that the Interchurch World Movement of North America was but an enlarged, intensified, and practical effort to carry into immediate effect the well thought-out plans of the Federal Council of the Churches of America — which is continuing its labors uninterrupted by the spasmodic efforts of these praise-worthy revivalists of their own number. Those who either disparage the work accomplished by the Interchurch Movement, or bewail the fact that it has disbanded, need to be reminded that as an organization it was superfluous; for the machinery for such a work was already in existence in the two federations of churches described in the preceding chapter — the Evangelical, and the Liberal. The spirit of unity was born and nurtured in both of these organizations. Either or both of them might have undertaken the task, and would have done so had all individuals

been awakened to its importance as were the few enthusiastic leaders.

While it is true that, as an organization, The Interchurch World Movement was short-lived, it is equally true that the ideal of self-sacrifice and service for humanity can never be destroyed. The ideal of service and self-sacrifice for others is the soul of all religions and the glory of our every-day existence. However varied and imperfect may be its future concrete expression, the spirit of the Interchurch Movement has come to stay and to continue its labors with ever-increasing measures of success. With a fuller sense of the spiritual oneness of all men of all races and nations of all ages Christendom is no longer divided into two hundred or more hostile sects, but is united by unity of aim into a true "body of Christ." The spread of the ideal of unity of action in a noble cause has automatically reduced Christendom to two contrasting divisions — a majority of Christ-servers, and a minority of self-seekers — those who are striving to Christianize civilization, and those who are indifferent or hostile to the movement.

It is a fact that the enthusiasm created by the challenging interchurch movement has penetrated all denominations (both those sects included and those excluded) and has awakened a wide-spread desire among all true Christians to enlist for the conflict that is going on everywhere today between good and evil, between right and wrong, between truth and error — a conflict necessary for Winning the World for Christ.

The manner and extent to which all denominations have been awakened by the plans and appeals of the Interchurch World Movement have become too long a story to be re-

corded in these pages. Suffice it to report for an illustration only the awakening of the complacent Unitarians to the importance of a closer union among their own independent organizations, and the need of increasing their own missionary labors by more personal efforts. Inspired by the report of the survey that there are sixty-five millions of unchurched individuals in the United States, the Unitarians are said to have undertaken to reach these neglected millions and invite them by personal appeal to join their ranks.

An illustration also of the spirit of federal unity outside of the evangelical denominations is furnished by "The Federation of Religious Liberals," who have always rejoiced in the belief that they constitute "the growing end of Christian fellowship." In December of the year 1922 the liberal churches started a movement to reorganize, and to change their name to the more inclusive one, "The Federation of Religion." The denominations included in the original Federation (headed by Emerson in 1867) desire to furnish some agency for fellowship to the excluded denominations, and to the many isolated organizations which have no central body to which they may look for sympathy, guidance, and aid in times of perplexity and doubt. These unfederated organizations consist of people's and community churches, independent congregations, ethical societies, and all religious bodies that have no neighbors who share their ideals, and no central body to which they may look for fellowship in services. The more inclusive new organization desires to preserve and to extend their traditional purpose of "fellowship beyond the lines of sect and creed." The basis of their broadened federation

is, "Perfect freedom in quest of pure religion." Some of their concrete aims are stated as follows: "To make religion effective in the life of the world; to serve as a clearing-house of information and inspiration; and to function in forms of coöperative effort." To carry into effect these objects, several new departments of service have been provided.

However, to seek and to save all sinners, the churched and the unchurched, is the avowed mission of all denominations, and none can possess the field alone. It always takes the world's full force to do the world's work. A more extended and expanded statement of the function of the ideal of The Interchurch World Movement would make it inclusive of all efforts that have been made or may be made by any denomination or individual to complete the Christianization of Christendom, and to redeem sinful men, and start them on the upward way to the attainment of the full measure of the spiritual stature of the Christ.

Concerning the function of money in the enterprise of Winning the World for Christ, there is great danger of a fatal misconception of its importance. The lesson of the corruption of the monks through money (though pledged to poverty) and the decline of the value of the monasteries through the power conferred by wealth (after they had declined in nobility of character) should never be forgotten. It is always true among the rich that the use of money may be taken as the measure of their sincerity and interest in any movement; but not so with all classes. Neither should the fact be overlooked that vast contributions of money by many individuals, put into the hands of a few leaders of organizations (who might be without divine

guidance), might become to these users of money a temptation. None need fear the ultimate failure of any worthy cause through lack of spontaneous funds pledged in advance. The student of history sees the real cause of all great state-wide, nation-wide, or world-wide movements to be an abiding desire for success developed through succeeding generations of like-minded individuals. Two or more generations of intensive education have preceded all great movements among the laity. The time element and the changes produced by growth should never be forgotten when judging of the success or failure of any movement.

The historian sees the primal cause of all human achievements to be spiritual forces, working silently, everywhere and always — that is, a prevailing desire for achievement. This supreme and prevailing desire is called true prayer. The first step then is education, instructive and constructive (not dogmatic or controversial), to awaken in the laity the imperious desire to win the world for Christ. Of the need of a foregoing righteous desire we may be assured; for it is the command of the Master given with a promise, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added."

How long it may take by an educational procedure (and all other methods that may be devised) led by the power of the Holy Spirit to win the world for Christ no one can predict. Whether the period may be regarded as long or as short depends upon the measuring rod employed; that is, whether we measure the "Sands of Time" by the hour-glass or by the cycle of two thousand years. Those who are impatient with the slow progress of Christian civilization should

recall that as God measures time, "A thousand years are but as a day when it is past." And the fullness of time for the creative achievements of our Heavenly Father is measured by eons and ages impossible for the human mind to comprehend.

The longer the time required to accomplish any great achievement, the more pressing is the necessity for beginning the work as early as possible. The eternal Now is always imperative in its demands, but lavish with proffers of possibilities and offers of opportunities to whosoever is willing to take up the Cross and follow the Master.

CHAPTER VIII

VENTURES AND ADVENTURES

The purpose of the discussion of the chapter now in hand is to call attention to some past failures of efforts to reunite the various branches of the visible Church; and to forecast some ventures and adventures necessary to clarify and enrich the creed of Christendom.

It must be conceded that a conscientious quest has been made in the past for a basis for the reorganization of the two branches of the Imperial Church and the many Protestant denominations. But as has been shown in foregoing chapters, these futile attempts have all been made upon some excluding creedal platform, or some desire for personal power and authority. On the contrary, Christian unity has been found at work only in activities involving self-sacrifice and requiring the united efforts of many for the performance of some great task.

Many overtures for reunion (impossible to review in this connection) have been made down the centuries. Suffice it to mention only a few illustrations selected from the many efforts made to secure a unified Church since the time of Constantine. For example, in recent years His Holiness Pope Leo XIII proposed unity under papacy; again the Anglican Communion has proposed what is known as "The Quadrilateral Program — the Bible, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the historic Episcopate." The Congrega-

tionalists and other denominations have formulated plans and have participated in other plans of unity presented them — all of which have failed. The Presbytarians and Methodists have failed in repeated efforts to reunite their various branches of dissenters that have withdrawn from the main bodies from time to time for various personal reasons. Pan- Presbyterianism and Pan- Methodistism are yet in the making. These futile attempts, however, are to be neither condemned nor allowed to become causes of discouragement; for they are necessary steps taken to learn how to create public opinion among succeeding generations of prejudiced and narrow-minded local leaders of society and the bigoted occupants of church pews.

Three plans for reuniting the three great branches of the Christian Church — the Roman, the Greek, and the Protestant — have been devised. These three plans represent the three types of mind that are characteristic of all historic movements — the ultra conservative, the moderately conservative, and the radical liberal.

The first plan proposed is a reactionary measure; a going back to some one of the denominations claiming direct Apostolic succession, and "to be the sole holder of Christ's commission." This plan would require on the part of all other denominations, "an unconditional surrender," like a penitent prodigal returning to a fond parent to seek forgiveness and to pledge complete submission in the future. Such a method of reorganization is proposed by the two branches of the Church — the Roman, and the Greek, that are still dominated by the idea of imperialism and hence claim a monopoly on Christianity.

The point of view and the barrier between these two

rival branches (both of which exclude Protestantism) has been voiced (in the September, 1904, issue of the *Constructive Quartely*) by the Bishop of Cremona, Italy. He says: "Yes, we must all unite under one banner; in union is the only means of obviating religious pulverization, and preventing the crumbling of faith under the constant gnawing of individual reason and the criticism that is independent of every consideration of tradition and authority. I can not, however, shut my eyes to the very grave difficulty of the enterprise; the Roman Church, with its definitions, with the affirmation repeated a thousand times of its Divine character, can well allow itself to be joined by dissident churches with unconditional surrender and submission; but it can not turn back, review its own decisions, modify its dogmas, change its hierarchy, lessen its authority. This I believe constitutes the great obstacle to that unity which is so greatly desired. The more I think of it, the more I feel my heart wrung, as I see the impossibility of finding a way out of so grave a difficulty. We Catholics can not suffer that to come into question which we have declared to be the truth. Come over the gulf to us; we will forthwith throw our arms about your necks; we shall then be sons of the same Mother and of the same Father who is in heaven."

The same issue of the *Constructive Quarterly* contains the words of the most Reverend Bishop Platon of Russia. He says: "It is true that we too are compelled to think of all those who do not confess Christ as does our Holy Church, as heretics. I know this, and in obedience to my Mother Church, I too think of Roman Catholics as heretics. At the same time, I know that they are Christians who be-

lieve in my Christ. I know that the time will come when they will believe in Christ as my Church believes in Him. But it is necessary to be Orthodox; we are Orthodox, and there is nothing for others to do but become Orthodox also. This view is shared by the overwhelming majority of us who belong to the Orthodox Church; to our thinking, the union of churches must and can take place only under the banner of Orthodoxy."

These same ideas of self-righteous exclusiveness are said to be shared by many Protestants, thus making the union of the Protestant denominations, as organizations, other than by federation, equally impossible at the present time.

The second plan of reorganization is a mere agreement among churches of different denominations to work together in harmony without the definite statement of a common creed, as is now exemplified in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. As has been shown in a foregoing chapter, federation is a voluntary union of certain communions having no power or desire to enforce its opinions by other than moral and spiritual means. This reasonable plan has been called contemptuously, "a mere mechanical union like a bundle of sticks, and not a vital and organic union."

A closer examination of the subject, however, discloses the fact that there are but two possible methods of reorganization — either a movement backward to either Roman or Greek imperialism, or a movement forward through federation into whatever is to follow among succeeding generations; for federation and consolidation (or mechanical and organic union) are coming to be looked at as but different steps or stages in the process of evolution from the imper-

fect to a more nearly perfect spiritual union among Christians.

What effect the overthrow of autocracy in the Asiatic and European States may have upon the polity of the Imperial churches can not be predicted with certainty by any one. But attention is here called to the fact that in the past, the Church organizations have been borrowed from those of the State at different periods of time. As was shown in an earlier chapter, the Roman Church is really a reborn Roman Empire with a Pope instead of an Emperor, a curian instead of a senate, and an arch-bishop for proconsul. Likewise the Episcopal Church is but English monarchy on its religious side, because when the established church was organized Church and State were still supposed to be one and inseparable. Presbyterianism with its representative form of government is but the form of government of the city of Geneva, Switzerland, at the time of John Calvin. The polity of the Congregational, Unitarian, and some other denominations is but a modified form of the New England town meetings in Colonial days in America.

With these many forms of church polity flourishing and growing in the United States today, it is natural to fancy that coming generations of Christians may form federations and federations of federations into a perfect *e pluribus unum* as is exemplified in the union of our forty-eight states into one mighty Republic with the millions of citizens loyal to one flag and one sovereignty.

When the spirit of unity comes among the churches, master minds can make use of any and all forms of local, national, and international organizations. Without doubt, the federation of churches now begun means the growth

of something broader, better, and more splendid than has yet been dreamed of. Of one thing we may be assured: future generations will dream dreams and their dreams will come true.

A third plan for reunion is that of a purely voluntary democratic Church. Such a plan is still in embryo and is but an ideal to be worked out in the fullness of time. It will probably require centuries of religious education and spiritual unfoldment together with a complete reorganization of our industrial, economic, and commercial life to make such an institution possible; for such a religious organization would demand a state of society where a struggle for spiritual life (the life more abundant) would take the place of the struggle for mere physical existence and the accumulation of material wealth which now prevails. A further discussion of a plan of religious education that may hasten the arrival of the Democratic Church (the Theocratic State) will receive further attention in the concluding chapter.

It is important to keep in mind that the desire for continuity, or continuous union in the chronological sense, such as is voiced in the Greek and Roman branches, is but a natural one for all thinking beings. There are thousands of persons today outside of these two branches who insist upon going back to Apostolic times to seek the foundation of the Church of Christ, and to gain assurance of the divine commission of its priesthood. Such minds regard no scheme of reunion of the churches as worthy of consideration that does not claim to possess authentic accounts and verified biographies of real personages. The desire to secure historical continuity in the visible church can not be regarded

as blameworthy unless it may arise from the hope of retaining authority over the lives of others for personal self-aggrandizement.

It may be granted that those who insist upon historical continuity are privileged, if they so desire, to go back beyond the time of Jesus of Nazareth until all is lost in antiquity. It in no way destroys the sacredness of the ordinance of Baptism and the Lord's Supper to know that they had their prototype in the rites and ceremonies belonging to the Mithric Mysteries of the long ago. Furthermore, "The Grand Man" perfect in all his parts, supposed to be emblazoned upon the starry heavens upon the twelve signs of the Zodiac, was long regarded by the Assyrians and other peoples as typifying the coming of the "Whole or Holy One," able to endure all temptations to which the whole race is subjected, yet to remain without sin, untouched by any moral weakness or fleshly infirmity. The idea of the Grand Man of the Zodiac appealed so strongly to the imagination of the earlier rāces, that the teachings of Astrology have come down to the present day as an evidence that myriads of men in the remote past have believed in "the Divine Man," perfect in both the moral and the physical sense. It is said that there are Christians today who believe in the sacredness of the number twelve, because they fancy that the twelve Signs of the Zodiac, the twelve Tribes of Israel, and the twelve Apostles all symbolize twelve stages of spiritual development through which every member of the human family must pass in order to attain the Christ type of character and powers.

But whatever may be the significance of the number twelve, it is true that, just as the existence of the heavenly

bodies, constantly revolving, gives us a set of persistent relations, so there is a traceable continuity between the earliest and the latest historic religions. As a matter of fact, there is a recognizable unity and continuity in all spiritual realities in all ages and in all lands — irrespective of names, creeds, or rituals. "God is spirit." All who worship in spirit and in truth constitute the invisible Church, yet to become united by an awakening of the spiritual consciousness, or God-consciousness of all Christians. This awakening of spiritual consciousness is the task of the hour — yes, of all succeeding days, years, and centuries until it has been accomplished.

The difficulties to be encountered in efforts to clarify and enrich the Christian Creed as a body of knowledge, and expression of opinions concerning God, man, and nature may be summed up as follows: first, the deep seated desire, on the part of some, to retain historic names and opinions and vested authority under these names; second, the separation of man-made creeds and ancient rites and ceremonies from the ethical doctrines of the Christ; third, the confounding of personal opinions concerning the Godhead with faith in the life and the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth; fourth, an insistence upon the acceptance of some special system of philosophy or science as being necessary to the acceptance of the ethical and spiritual teachings of the Christ. All these and other obstacles must be encountered in attempts to determine just what is meant by (or may be included in) the universal system of Christian doctrines. Such is the task of Winning the World for Christ.

While the ethical teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, as a

religious system, are distinct from any and all systems of philosophy or science, the manner in which these conceptions help or hinder the progress of Christianity has been briefly considered in the chapter on the relation between Theology and Science. Doubtless other battles of like bitterness will follow other discoveries that will be made by men of science in their further study of the invisible world of unsuspected realities of nature all about us. It is the expectation of some persons that the next forward step in Adventures in Faith will be taken by some hoped-for World Conference of Creed-makers for which preparations will be made by all denominations.

It is said that the labors of all creed-makers of the future will involve a double task: first, the elimination of all harmful accretions of superstitions and erroneous conceptions of the Christ that have twined themselves around Jesus of Nazareth; and second, the restoration of certain neglected, forgotten, and perverted truths concerning the human soul, said to belong to the "Wisdom of the Ages" still in the keeping of true illuminates. These conceptions that are said to have been dropped out of the Christian consciousness pertain to the birth and evolution of the human soul; the resurrection of the so-called dead in a fleshly body; the true nature and location of heaven and hell; the redemptive process of vicarious atonement; the nature and the growth of the spiritual body; the psychological process of conversion; and the means for promoting the growth of the personality into the full measure of the stature of the Christ — all these sacred mysteries belong by right of spiritual insight to the clarified and enriched Christian creed. Likewise some great spiritual truths once delivered

to the saints and known to the earlier mystics are said to have been misinterpreted and misapplied to the detriment of many — as has been illustrated by the story of the abuse of the idea of penitence (that forsakes sin and seeks to make restitution) by the practice of penance and the sale of indulgences.

In the opinion of some the barriers that still exist between the various denominations of Christians are but indistinct lines of prejudice, education, and temperament; yet the fact remains that there are many persons today who are unconscious slaves to certain inherited formula and faith, rituals and organizations, while others are still more abject slaves to an inherited hatred of these same things.

And while there are those who insist upon historical continuity, there are also others who are satisfied with the so-called "mythical accounts" of miraculous happenings which disclose to them the meaning of life and furnish impressive ideals of conduct.

The conclusion, then, is inevitable that with the assumption of a different view-point and the acceptance of a dissimilar "body of knowledge," the spiritual vision of these two types of mind must be dissimilar. Doubtless the time is near at hand when the wisdom of further efforts to unite (except by federation) existing organizations will be discontinued. For it is the testimony of the Master of Galilee that "new wine" is put into "old bottles" at the peril of both the wine and the bottles. There is real danger that, without several generations of spiritual unfoldment among the laity, an undesirable form of "Churchianity," produced by compromise instead of by comprehension might result from premature efforts to unify the faith and practice of the two hundred or more Christian sects.

It is equally evident that Christian unity (expressed in a reorganization of local churches) will come about when individuals in every community learn to love their neighbors as themselves. Then nothing but unity in thought, purpose, and action (seeking the highest good of all) will satisfy their own deepest desire. Doubtless some plan of union more extended in scope and inclusive in purposes than has yet been proposed will secure the spiritual union among the sects, regardless of historic continuity. Hence it is probable that the complete transition from imperialism to democracy in the Church of Christ will be attained through the union of like-minded individuals, rather than through the union of jealous and discordant organizations as they exist today.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The foregoing survey of the spread of Christianity among the various races and nations of the earth; the Romanizing of Christianity, the subsequent efforts of emancipated minds to throw off the tyrannical yoke of imperial ecclesiasticism, and the consequent rise of two hundred or more Protestant sects; together with the many coöperative movements of today — all these changes reveal some of the unifying agencies that have brought Christian unity to its present status.

These unifying and cohesive forces may be summed up as follows: The acceptance of Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah; faith in Him as the divine redeemer of sinful men; a common hope of escaping Hell and gaining Heaven through the ministrations of the priesthood of the Roman Church; unanimity of opinions derived from the study of the sacred Scriptures and other literature concerning God's plan of redemption and salvation of the human soul; preference for some particular rites, ceremonies, and forms of Church government — all these diverse agencies have served to unite individuals (in accordance with the laws of spiritual affinities) automatically into self-excluding groups called denominations.

In addition to the above named influences, it is also seen that the most potent unifying forces are those activi-

ties that have required concerted action among Christians for defense against some common enemy or for the execution of some nation-wide or world-wide project, as may be illustrated by national defense against the encroachment of conquerors, or the Crusades of the Middle Ages, or missionary efforts to win the world for either Allah or the Christ. It was love for the Christ that constrained Paul in his day. The same constraining love for the Christ has impelled multitudes of individuals to acts of self-sacrifice for others — inspired by the words of the Master, "In as much as ye have done it unto the least of these, even so have ye done it unto Me." For two thousand years loyalty to Jesus of Nazareth as the divine redeemer of the race has served to enforce His command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every living creature."

Furthermore, four hundred years of experience in the exercise of the right of private judgment concerning the meaning of the Scriptures, and full liberty of conscience in the worship of God, have, for the present and all future generations, an important message. It is the verdict of experience that uniformity of opinions can not be secured by any form of outward compulsion; but, on the contrary, a sense of personal freedom opens the human mind to the influences of the Holy Spirit, which is always seeking the highest good of all. As a logical inference derived from the foregoing facts, the conclusion may be reached that whatever form the reorganized Church of the future may take, it will always remain her mission to promulgate those ethical teachings that produce Christ-like character and conduct. Since the salvation of the soul has come to mean according to the understanding of the present generation

the development of the human into the full measure of the Divine Man, the Christ, the *damnation of the soul* must mean the lack of growth of character into the desired image of God. With these two contrasting ideas of "salvation" and "damnation" in mind, abundant motives exist today for making efforts to save all humanity from perishing by their own acts of spiritual suicide. To save all souls groping in spiritual darkness from self-destruction by the fires of their own lusts and passions is the task involved in "Winning the World for Christ."

In this enlightened age throughout Christendom all men have become usable instruments in the hands of God for the accomplishment of His divine purposes; therefore, all followers of the Christ are today viceregents of His Holy Catholic Church — alike clergy and laity, priest and parishioner. What the content of the clarified and enriched Christian Creed may be, consequently, is the concern of all true Christians. But whatever else it may include, it is certain to center around the two great commandments, "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thy neighbor as thyself."

Whoever may show bitterness on account of the growth of the democratic spirit among the various denominations only demonstrates the fact that he has not yet put on the spiritual yoke of the Master which makes it a joy to recognize the rights of all, and to minister to the needs of others.

It has been said: "The Church of the greater Christianity must set a high standard of intelligence for her people and demand a special fitness and preparation for her

ministers and teachers. She must be able to develop character, maintain the Christian home, and preserve the spiritual life of the nation. She must be more than a mere banding together of self-righteous saints; she must be a shelter for the unfortunate, and refuge for the oppressed; she must be the mother of nations, training all in truth and righteousness, inspiring them with high thoughts, and impelling them to daily acts of humble service for needy souls. She must foster such a spirit of internationalism as will hasten the establishment of universal peace, 'the glad tidings of great joy' heralded twenty centuries ago in the name of the Christ."

Several similes may be employed to illustrate the invisible things of the spirit. Religious progress may be likened to a series of concentric circles, ever increasing in circumference. Taking the idea of God as a center, circles of various radii mark the progress that has been made from the time of ancient Judaism to modern Christianity. A circle constructed on the short radius of unmodified monotheism produces a small but inclusive circle which furnishes standing-room alike for Judaism, Greek and Roman Catholicism, and all of the Protestant sects. (It also includes Mohammedanism and all other monotheists.) Thus the concept of *one God* brings these people together through a common understanding of a great fact in nature; and no cohesive force is required to hold them together within this small circle of God-consciousness. Such a company of like-minded individuals, today, may be called the Catholic Church of the One God.

At the time of the incarnation of the Christ, the Jewish idea of the *One God* was that of a vengeful national deity,

Jehovah. This excluding concept confined Judaism within a small and self-limited circle. But it was the mission of Jesus of Nazareth to modify Jewish monotheism by the concept of a loving Heavenly Father Who is the God of all races and nations. This lengthened radius of modified monotheism expanded the arc of the circle of Judaism and produced the inclusive circle, called Christendom, which now contains two hundred or more sects. Any attempt to place these sects within the circle would show that each denomination, by some divisive concept, is self-limited to a mere sector of the circle. Space forbids an attempt at such a placement; but the suggestion illustrates the relationship between the arcs of the circle and the whole circle — that is, the relationship between the parts and the whole. The Circle of Christendom today contains a like-minded company that may be called the Catholic Church of the Living Christ of God.

Another simile may be employed to explain "the Paradox of Being," that is, the fact of the spiritual union of all men, while many believe that their personal and individual interests are often in deadly conflict. In this matter of "an unconscious unity of spirit," individuals may be likened to the leaves on a tree; for, exactly as the leaves on a tree may be unconscious of their common life in the sustaining root buried in the earth, so, too, human beings, until illuminated by the Holy Spirit, are unaware of their spiritual existence in the common Fatherhood of God. This paradox of being is repeated in the spiritual oneness of all members of the Church, represented by two hundred or more apparently conflicting concepts expressed in sectarianism.

May it suffice to say further that since the fourth century, as a system of thought, Christianity has been unfolding itself in three recognizable periods, each of which has stressed some different aspect of the God-head. The first of these periods retained the Jewish idea of God as an avenger of His disobedient children; and His wrath was symbolized by eternal torment in a lake of everlasting fire.

The second period of Trinitarianism (the humanitarian age in which we are now living) worships the Son, the Divine Man, by means of service to the race. As has been previously stated, the Master's assurance, "In as much as ye have done it unto the least of these, even so have ye done it unto Me," today furnishes Christians with the motive to worship God through service to man.

There is abundant evidence that we are entering a third period of Trinitarianism, which is beginning to recognize more fully the power of the Holy Spirit over human lives. This mysterious influence is the promised Comforter which is to bring all things to our remembrance and to lead the race into All Truth. It is to be expected, then, that the future Church of Christ will be composed of spiritually-minded individuals who will be able to recognize under various forms, "the unity and continuity of all things" both material and spiritual. Such a like-minded company would constitute a true Democratic Church of the Holy Spirit of God, Infinite and Eternal.

Again, the manner of the development of the Christian sects may be likened to the growth of a branching tree. For it is the testimony of modern Science that from the biological trunk of "the Tree of Physical Life" have been produced, by a process of branching and rebranching, all

forms of physical life — both the flora and the fauna of the earth. The record of the unfoldment of physical life on earth, as it was written on the rocks during the geologic eons, is the story of the creation of an endless variety of perishable forms. It seems as if Mother Nature has always been conducting a series of experiments to discover physical forms best suited to her varying needs during countless ages of continuous change. This mode of progress has been rightly called by those possessing the God-consciousness, "theistic evolution."

The same law of growth by a process of branching and rebranching is seen in all the developments of the human family and their various and varying institutions. To this law of growth by "differentiation" the Christian Church is no exception. As the spiritualized student reads the historic scroll, he recognizes Judaism as the root of the Tree of Christianity; Romanism as the vital trunk that has sent forth many living branches; and he judges that the future fruitage of Christianity will result from the spiritual vitality of this age-old Tree of God-consciousness.

Hence, from the scientific standpoint, in the entire history of sectarianism nothing deplorable may be discovered except those violations of the law of love that have led to cruel persecutions of Christians by Christians for mere opinion's sake. And the indisputable fact remains that love, divine and redemptive, is a universal and omnipotent unifying force operating always in unsuspected places and ways.

What high destiny is awaiting the full development of the sacred Tree of Spiritual Life, "whose leaves are for the healing of the nations," the unaided human mind can not

foresee. But it is written, "Blessed are they who do His commandments, that they may have a right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city of God."

In the further quest for the rightful interpreter of the Sacred Scriptures, encouragement is found in the fact that "Modernism" which is penetrating even Romanism itself forecasts the final fall of both the imperial churches of Rome and Greece, as also the dogmatic Protestant Creed-makers of the past from the assumed pedestal of supreme authority in religion. It has been prophesied that the coming democratic Church of the Holy Spirit will transfer the final "Court of Appeal" to the God-consciousness of all redeemed men who are now being led into all Truth — Truth, the one and only spiritual reality manifested in ever changing facts and forms from everlasting to everlasting.

AUTHORS CONSULTED

1. Rotteck's History of the World.
2. Barnes's General History.
3. Milman's Latin Christianity.
4. Bowden's Life and Times of Hildebrand.
5. Geike's English Reformation.
6. Carlyle's Heroes and Hero Worship.
7. Allen's Three Great Periods of Christian History.
8. Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.
9. Herney's Compendium of History.
10. Guizot's History of Civilization.
11. Hallam's Middle Ages.
12. Digby's Ages of Faith.
13. Neander's Church History.
14. Morrison's Life and Times of Saint Bernard.
15. John Lord's Beacon Lights of History.
16. Hibbert's Journal — From 1910 on.
17. The Constructive Quarterly — Many issues.
18. Moncrief's Church History.
19. Macaulay's History of England.
20. Encyclopedia Britannica.
21. Catholic Encyclopedia.
22. Biblical World, and Homiletic Review.
23. Sanford's Church Federation (1905), and Federal Council (1908).
24. Macfarland's Christian Unity at Work (1902).

25. Reports of Federation of Religious Liberals (from 1905 to 1922).
26. Ten Pamphlets on Faith and Order by Joint Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church.
27. Bishop Anderson's Christian Unity.
Current Religious magazines of many denominations, both Protestant and Catholic.

This book may be kept

FOURTEEN DAYS

from last date stamped below. A fine of TWO CENTS will be charged for each day the book is kept over time.

JUN '40			
STORED CHAPEL			
APR 0 4 1990			

3 2060 00064 6417

14536